DECEMBER, 1938 PRICE 15c

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

VOL. XV No. 12

THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

THE ANTI-JEWISH POGROMS

PACIFISM OR CLASS STRUGGLE?

WHITHER IS DALADIER LEADING?

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—A WARNING

PEASANTS AND REVOLUTION

•

INDEX TO VOL. XV

SOCIAL AND NATIONAL SECURITY

By EARL BROWDER

What does the Munich Pact mean for the security of America? How can the American people meet the threat of reaction at home and fascist aggression from abroad?

These questions are answered in the report by Earl Browder, General Secretary, to the December, 1938, meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. **48 pages; 5 cents**

●

AFTER MUNICH

THE UNITED FRONT
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT
AND OF THE PEOPLES AGAINST FASCISM

by

GEORGI DIMITROFF

also

THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY
OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST
REVOLUTION

(Manifesto of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, November 7, 1938)

10c

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, GERMAN, FRENCH, CHINESE AND SPANISH

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

VOL. XV DECEMBER, 1938 No. 12

CONTENTS

Editorials

The Anti-Jewish Pogroms 1067

Whither Is Daladier Leading His Party and France? 1070

Henri de Man—His Path and His Aim 1073

The Munich Conspiracy and the Dutch 1076

Theory and Practice of the Labor Movement

Forward on the Front of Theory! 1079

Pacifism or Class Struggle? . . . . . PETER WIEDEN . . 1085

The Policy of the Labor and Socialist International and the Fascist Offensive . . . . . KURT FUNK . . 1098

Czechoslovakia—a Warning to All Nations . . RUDOLF ARNOLD . 1107

The Revolution in Austria in 1918 . . . . . F. FURNBERG . . 1114

The Peasants in the Year 1918-1919 . . . . . OTTO FISCHER . . 1120

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC., P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year $1.75; six months 90 cents. Single copies 15 cents

Printed in U.S.A

In the Soviet Union

Soviet Culture . . . . . A. CLAIRE . . . 1130

Documents

On the Form of Party Propaganda in Relation to the Publication of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* 1135

(*Resolution of Central Committee, C.P.S.U.*)

Chronicle of Events 1148

Index—Vol. XV, 1938 1153

The Anti-Jewish Pogroms

SOME years before Hitler's coup d'état, the world was shocked by the bloody deeds of two German murderers, Haarmann and Denke. Those were single cases of depravity, but today such things are universal in Germany, and a part of the government's policy.

The methodical extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jews who were unfortunate enough to be Germans was officially inspired and carried out with Prussian thoroughness. It has been more terrible than anything in history. Nero's persecution of the Christians, the burning of heretics by the Inquisition, and the pogroms of tsarist Russia are nothing compared with the German fascists' murderous campaign against the Jews. In cold blood, not in some crazy outburst, the Nazis have condemned hundreds of thousands of defenseless people to a terrible end. They have revived the philosophy of barbarism in the very center of Europe. They have put under state management the crime which Haarmann and Denke committed and made its perpetration the duty of every citizen. Goering, chief huntsman of the Reich, and his pack are hunting human beings. Their ancestors in the forests of primeval Germany considered it dishonorable to kill defenseless people. The German fascists seem to have gone back to the violence of the barbarians, but not to their code of honor.

In Paris a seventeen-year-old Jew shot a representative of the state where Jews are proscribed. This young man's parents are starving in no-man's-land. Together with fifteen thousand other Jews and Poles, they were torn from their beds, herded into cattle trucks and driven towards Poland to the accompaniment of kicks and blows. They were met at the Polish frontier with a salute of guns. Bullets drove them from the German frontier. A prey to the cold, to hunger, and to death, they wandered to and fro between the two states. Fifteen thousand people face a terrible fate in no-man's-land, mocked by the German press, which considers it a joke that men and women, old people and children should meet their deaths between two states for no other reason than that they are Jews.

Their frightful cry for help died away at the baize doors, behind which sat refined Englishmen and amiable Frenchmen, representatives of the world of culture. The result was a desperate resort to arms, to shout from the housetops the truth which the world has refused to admit, namely, that German fascism dooms not only fifteen thousand human beings, but every human standard to no-man's-land and to extermination.

This desperate boy resorted to arms because he had lost all faith in the power of words, but the leaders of the Nazi terror were really responsible for his deed. The doors of the German Embassy were opened with amazing rapidity to this seventeen-year-old boy. An outlaw was able to rush straight into the closely guarded study of a fascist diplomat. He was given an opportunity to fire his shot unhindered. Three thousand francs were found in his pocket. The results of his shot had been carefully prepared. The German fascists know how to drive people to desperation, and they also know how to use that desperation in their own propaganda. The men who organized the attacks on Bartou, Dollfuss, Lessing and many others doubtless knew how to fit into their plans any enemy whom they had almost driven mad.

The news of the shooting of a German

diplomat was quietly received by the German people. Violent deaths have been common in Germany of recent years. Fascism's trail of blood leads from the coup d'état to the assassinations of June 30, 1934, and on to the murders of brave Liesel Herrmann and of other anti-fascists. There is nothing about the violent death of a fascist diplomat to arouse the people particularly. But the fascist Führer demanded "Fury of the people." The fascist gangs were let loose. At their leaders' orders, they broke into and plundered every Jewish shop. They entered Jewish homes, smashed everything to matchwood, and took away the valuables. They set fire to synagogues, and massacred in the streets people who looked Jewish. They made Jewish women and girls lie down on the pavements, and marched over their bodies. Their leaders, in the words of their own Horst Wessel song, "were marching, in spirit, in their ranks." The fascist leaders applauded, and announced that this was only a prelude, only a dress rehearsal, to rouse the appetites of their followers.

This inhuman and premeditated destruction was followed by the so-called "Fury of the People," from which the German people, disgusted and ashamed, stood apart. The corpses were not cold, the trampled women had not risen to their feet, before murder and robbery received official sanction. In Vienna, 10,000 Jews were imprisoned. In Munich, 6,000 Jews were driven out of their homes and given 24 hours to quit the Reich. They received neither passports nor visa—their cards, they were told, were the only papers they would get. In Munich, all bakeries and provision shops were forbidden to sell to Jews. Orders were given throughout Germany that no Jews were to be admitted to theaters, cinemas, cafés, restaurants, swimming pools, or parks. The Jews were ordered to repair immediately, at their own cost, the shops which the Nazis had smashed, and to replace doors and windows, so as not to shock foreigners. The insurance companies were forbidden to pay out money to Jewish claimants. Jews were advised to liquidate all independent businesses and resign all leading positions within fourteen days. Employers were ordered to fire their Jewish employees. Finally, a so-called indemnity of one billion marks was imposed on the Jews.

Calculated vandalism and premeditated madness are too terrible to describe in words, because words are the medium for describing the actions of human beings. The peace which the English gentlemen won for their time at Munich has already broken out in Germany, and its brutality is inhuman.

Before the rescuer flew to its aid, German fascism was down and fighting for breath. For that it is now taking its revenge. Before Munich, the German people had, for the first time, seen the executioner's hand tremble, and the German fascists had felt, as never before, the hatred and disgust of the people. They felt the awakening of the people, and they felt the desire of hundreds of thousands for an opportunity to desert to the armies of democracy. German soldiers took tanks to the Czechoslovakian soldiers as presents from the anti-fascists of Germany. German soldiers on the Western frontier refused to fight the French. Germans forced to work on the completion of fortifications openly announced their intention of joining the French army as volunteers. There were unprecedented excitement and hope among the mass of Germans. After Munich, the German fascists carried out reprisals for the trembling of their own hands, and for those first rays of freedom's light which had penetrated to the German nation.

Their revenge falls on the whole nation, not only on the Jews. If the leaders of one of the murder gangs discover that their followers are turning away from them in disgust, they try to close every path which might lead them back to an honorable and decent life.

In the same way, the German fascists are trying to associate the whole German nation with their own terrible deeds in the eyes of the world, and to brand the whole people with infamy. They are counting on the world believing that a massacre carried out on orders by a few thousand bandits is a national movement. They are counting on the world holding

the whole German people responsible for the unspeakable vandalism of a well-drilled gang of murderers. They mean to blacken the Germans before the whole world, and thus preserve their power over them. The Nazi leaders have proclaimed triumphantly that the German people is universally hated. They go on to say that the German does not desire to be loved, but to be feared.

Their outcry has revealed their plan to use the world's disgust to isolate the Germans from the civilized nations. The blood of harmless Jews is to be used to bind the German people to the fascist murderers. Moreover, those in power in Germany intend to extend their barbarous persecution of the Jews to other countries, so as to strengthen reactionaries and prepare the way for German imperialism.

In the face of this terrible plan evolved by the German fascists, every decent German must protest against the anti-Jewish pogroms, and defend the German people. The nation of Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Humboldt must not be lost in an orgy of fascist bestiality. The fascists shall not succeed in silencing the German people, and reducing them to their own level.

The persecution of the German and Austrian Jews has aroused great indignation throughout the civilized world. In the United States and in England, the whole nation is protesting against the barbarians who are defying all human standards and dishonoring Germany. The colonial peoples have realized what is in store for them if they are handed over to Germany. They and every other nation whose independence is threatened by the Nazis have seen the misery which awaits them if they do not defend their freedom with vigor.

The terror which followed Munich is now to be extended to the Catholics and to "Aryans" who oppose the fascist massacres. The Nazi leaders have proclaimed their intention of plunging the whole world into chaos if Germany's crazy actions are checked. Actually, the opposite is true. The world will be saved from the barbarism which the Nazis call peace only if the peoples put an end to the fascists' massacres.

The unprecedented persecution of the Jews which has followed Munich demonstrates that fascism cannot be weakened by concessions, but can only be checked by firm resistance. These pogroms should be a terrible warning to all nations, and make them get together in a world-wide alliance against fascism.

Whither Is Deladier Leading His Party And France?

ON SEPTEMBER 29, in Munich, Daladier trod underfoot like a rag of paper the Pact of Mutual Assistance between France and Czechoslovakia and signed what has rightly been called the "Abdication of France." A month later at the Marseilles Congress again he treated like a scrap of paper the vow taken on June 14, 1935, with which the Radical Party sealed the alliance of the middle classes with the working class to defend democratic liberties against fascism. For Daladier, the laws which guaranteed to the workers all that they had achieved in the bitter struggle of 1936 have also become scraps of paper, the last decrees suspend the decisions of parliament. And finally the program and the traditional progressive principles of the Radical Party, on which is founded its influence on the middle classes and on sections of the working class itself, have also become scraps of paper.

In this symbol of denial and betrayal, Daladier, who hitherto had gladly posed as a "Jacobin," presented himself in Marseilles as the spokesman of the "Two hundred families," of that "oligarchy" against which the fighting traditions of the Radicals are directed. And behind this oligarchy could be seen the shadows of the men of Munich—Hitler, Mussolini and Chamberlain—who fear nothing so much as the successes and the effects of the People's Front on the whole world, the hopes and stirrings which it arouses among the oppressed peoples. Daladier openly fulfilled his obligations to his Munich partners when he declared furious war on the People's Front, and aimed his most vicious blows and slanderous accusations at the working class, the backbone of the People's Front, and the Communist Party, its most ardent champion.

The saddest spectacle at this Thirty-fifth Congress of the Radical Party at Marseilles was the systematic obstruction and the organized howling which the notorious gangsters of Marseilles raised against all those speakers who dared to defend the purest traditions of their party. Albert Bayet, who had the courage to denounce "the pacifism of fear and cowardice," can tell a tale of this. It was sufficient to mention the principles of the great French Revolution, to stand up for the ideas of democracy and freedom, to call to memory the February days of 1934, in order to be "outlawed" at this congress of the Radical Party. Decidedly fascist practices were shown at the congress of this party, a party which has so often broken a lance for the freedom of opinion, the press and of meetings. One might almost believe that in Marseilles they wanted to apply Goebbels' "directive": "the year 1789 must be erased from history," and many a delegate said bitterly that the Radical Party had allowed fascism to "build units" within it.

Nothing less than the whole authority of Herriot was necessary in order to make the congress understand that Daladier's policy was leading the Radical Party to fascism, to its own suicide as a party. At the congress, Herriot gave expression to the desire of the middle classes in town and country for closer unity with the working class, the fortress of democracy and of the independence of France. At this congress, at which real discussion was impossible, Herriot was able to say:

"Without the unity of the middle classes and the mass of the people, our Party will suffer bankruptcy," and "without the help of the working class it is impossible to get France on her feet again."

It was Herriot, too, who spoke against the policy of isolating the Soviet Union and for the maintenance of the pact between France and the Soviet Union. Only by staring Daladier straight in the face was he able to compel a weak nod of agreement. And when Herriot praised the attitude of Roosevelt during the crisis, and in his closing appeal pointed with emotion to the Austrian and Czechoslovak republics, on the one hand, and to the republics of China and Spain on the other, and cried:

"How many more examples do you need in order, at last, to make you reflect a little? Will you sacrifice freedom? Will you give up the political conditions which are founded on it?"

Then one felt at this congress the breath that still animated the Radical Party.

In the days following the congress it became still clearer that the mass of the Radical Party was in no mind to allow Daladier his arbitrary measures against the party and against France, to that Daladier whose desire it is to use the party as a screen under which to carry on the policy of Flandin, Tardieu and Laval, of reaction allied with fascism.

At the congress, Daladier declared: "The People's Front exists no longer." But after the congress, Daladier could see that the People's Front, even though sentenced to death, was by no means dead. Therefore, he brought the party executive committee, by a vote of thirteen to six, to the decision that the Radical Party withdraw from the People's Front. But numerous organizations of the Radical Party replied by strengthening their loyalty to the People's Front. Daladier had forgotten one small thing, that the People's Front is no voting agreement, not just an alliance of different parliamentary factions, but a *mass movement*, and that the masses have been *convinced by their own experience* that only by their unity in the struggle have they been able to ward off fascism until now, and that only by still more unified and more energetic struggle will they be able to achieve victory over fascism.

In the Radical Party, demonstrations of sympathy with the People's Front are on the increase. The Radical Party, which considers itself to be the axis of the whole political life of France, can play its part only in complete understanding with the working class, which today has a united C.G.T. (General Confederation of Labor) five million strong. If the working class *alone* under present conditions cannot triumph over fascism, then the middle class *alone* is even less able to do so. And it is this community of interest which is the foundation and the strength of the People's Front and is embodied in the closely woven net of local mass organizations throughout the whole country.

The enemies of the People's Front had counted on introducing the seed of dissension in the C.G.T. in order to break the People's Front. But they miscalculated. The Declaration which the C.G.T. issued even during the Radical Party Congress, in answer to the slanders of Daladier against the working class, was Daladier's first failure. It was as if Daladier had had his ears boxed, right at the congress, from this truly proletarian declaration, in the name of the workers of France, who through their struggle had made France a leading power for social progress.

A second warning for Daladier and the *Comité des Forges* was the unanimity with which the C.G.T. Congress at Nantes opposed the Emergency Decrees and decided on the general strike. Further warnings are the wave of strikes and mass demonstrations taking place over the whole of France; the strengthening of unity of action between the Communist and the Socialist Parties; the strong protest of the ex-servicemen whom the Two Hundred Families again tried to use as a shield against the workers; the declaration of the retailers

and craftsmen expressing their solidarity with the proletariat; and finally, the increase of aid on *a mass scale* for the Spanish republic is another warning.

When, in the face of this determination and will to fight the *Temps* declares that: "The Communist Party, the Socialist Party and the C.G.T. are the opposition today," one can only smile, for it could just as well be said that the majority of the nation has joined the opposition. The truth is that the union of national forces, now taking place, makes for profound differences in the Radical Party itself, the parliamentary party being already split into three groups. The swaggering Daladier who is afraid to speak in the name of his country cannot even safely say that the majority of the party, of which he is President, is behind him.

In spite of, or rather because of, the opposition that he feels rising against him, Daladier declared that he would go on "to the end." Where is this "end" which he would so gladly reach? Certainly, in order to get there quicker, he has taken the path of the miserable decrees so as to abolish all achievements of the People's Front, to worsen the living conditions of the middle classes as well as of the working classes, the path of suppression of democratic liberties. In order the quicker to reach this end, Daladier's government is still silent in the face of the monstrous Nazi pogroms which have called forth a storm of protest from all democratic nations. Does not the introduction of a press censorship, which would allow Hitler to bludgeon and poison French public opinion, also lie on this road? Does not the agreement between France and Hitler Germany which Daladier presented to the French people belong here also?

Is it not a sign of the times that Daladier was only able to secure a majority in the Finance Committee by the threat that he would "put off" the visit of the English Prime Minister? Is not that the best proof of the fact that in reality Chamberlain directs French finances? And when Daladier declares that the present strikes of the French workers against the Emergency Decrees are directed against his foreign policy, is not that the best proof of the fact that between him and Chamberlain and Hitler there exist agreements over the wages, the hours of work and the right to strike of the French workers? How otherwise could he describe these problems as problems of foreign policy? Is this the "end" to which the people of France are to be led?

The growing movement of the French people gives room for hope that in spite of the advice and warnings of Downing Street and the Wilhelmstrasse Daladier will not reach this end but will stop by the way—to the benefit of France and of democracy.

Daladier who wept at the fighting in 1934, Daladier who got drunk with words when it was necessary to organize the struggle against the Two Hundred Families, Daladier who today poses as an imitator of Napoleon so that no one shall see that he is only a puppet of the *Comité de Forges*, of Chamberlain and Hitler—Daladier dishonors France before the whole world.

Henri De Man—His Path and His Aims

SHORTLY after the betrayal at Munich which threatens the democratic liberties of all countries, there took place the Conference of the Belgian Socialists at which there was very full discussion of the foreign policy of the Belgian government, for which the Premier Spaak is responsible. Both Spaak and de Man spoke at the debates on this subject and both spoke, among other things, in favor of recognition being given to the Spanish rebel government of Franco. They also had a word to say on behalf of an understanding with German fascism as a continuance of the policy of "neutrality" which they had approved and implemented and which in fact only plays into the hands of the fascist war-criminals.

This is a sufficiently important reason for giving somewhat closer attention to de Man, one of those reactionaries in the working class camp who, in theory and practice, have long smoothed the way for fascism.

In their settlement of accounts with Höchberg and his comrades, Marx and Engels wrote in their circular letter addressed to Bebel:

"These are the same people who under the pretense of indefatigable activity not only do nothing themselves but also try to prevent anything happening at all except chatter; the same people whose fear of every form of action in 1848 and 1849 obstructed the movement at every step and finally brought about its downfall; the same people who see a reaction and are then quite astonished to find themselves at last in a blind alley where neither resistance nor flight is possible; the same people who want to confine history within the narrow petty-bourgeois horizon and over whose heads history invariably proceeds to the order of the day." *

This description is borne out in part in Henri de Man. He is the son of well-to-do parents. Just before finishing school, he joined the Belgian Socialist movement in the desire to raise the "poor, helpless, uneducated workers" to the heights of the educated bourgeoisie. Like the German Social-Democrat Paul Göhre, a parson by profession, he worked for a time as a factory hand but found himself uncomfortable when surrounded by dirty hands and considered how it might be possible to overcome the dirty hands in factories without touching capitalism.

The young student who had read Voltaire and Rousseau and who spoke and wrote four languages was unhappy about the "rough" and "uneducated" workers to whom Voltaire was a book with seven seals. But they have other cares. Far in advance of him they possess a consciousness, which de Man could never acquire in the whole of his political activity—class-consciousness. They united in the Socialist Party. They carried on a political struggle against the infamous capitalist system which looks on the worker as nothing but a tool with the gift of speech and allows him to exist only as such. Nevertheless, Henri de Man, who never acquired the proletarian outlook but remained full of bourgeois prejudices, joined the Socialist youth movement in 1905, not in order to fill it with Socialist spirit and Socialist energy but to introduce into it those accomplishments which

* *The Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, pp. 374-75. International Publishers, New York.

to him had meant happiness and fortune from his university days onwards.

At the time when reformism flourished most abundantly within Belgian Social-Democracy, he wrote, together with de Brouckère, a treatise on the Socialist movement in Belgium, in which he too threw light on the morass of reformism. But he answered the question, what was to be done, in the spirit of the petty-bourgeois Socialist: "The problem which we are facing is a problem of education." And that was all. That was the invitation to the workers to lay aside their "rough proletarian passions," to acquire, under the leadership of educated philanthropic bourgeois, "good tone" and "good taste."

The World War put an end to his "reclamatory efforts."

There is a film which shows how a man lost his memory as a result of the great war. With de Man the opposite was the case. Immediately on the outbreak of the war he remembered that he was an offspring of the bourgeoisie. He joined the army and became an officer. In 1917 he went to Russia in order to move the Russian workers to further "resistance." They held out, but not in the way that de Man had expected. Their "holding out" was a mighty historical reckoning with the capitalists, bankers and landlords. And this reckoning bears the proud name: the socialist October Revolution.

But de Man had never before imagined the way to socialism to be like this. When, with the end of the war, the flame of revolution flared up in still other countries in Europe, the "humane" de Man, now suddenly become a pacifist, stayed no longer in Europe. He fled before the glare of revolution to the new continent and there hurried from country to country forever looking behind to make sure the revolution was not still following him.

However, when counter-revolution stabilized itself in Germany, thanks to the help of the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, de Man went to Germany, settled himself firmly in the lovely scenery of Darmstadt in order to dedicate himself, in ten years of contemplative quiet, to "theoretical" work. At the same time he lectured at Workers' College in Frankfurt-on-Main.

Thus, in 1926 appeared his book, *On the Psychology of Socialism.* In this he produced a distorted caricature of Marxism in order to "refute" it. Greatly rejoiced, the bourgeois hacks cried: "At last a correct refutation of Marxism!" Here scientific Socialism is only "social knowledge in the service of socialist conscience." Here he jeers at the workers and writes: "The working class is socially at a disadvantage because it feels itself to be so, not the reverse," a sentence which the Nazi Ley repeated dozens of times after 1933. But already in this book, peace at any price was set up to be the most important and immediate task of socialism. For the rest, the book drips with nothing but "justice" and "righteousness" and "divinity of conscience." In his mechanistic outlook de Man is reminiscent of the metaphysics of a Büchner or a Häckel, and, in his psychology, of Freud and Bergson.

De Man "studied" and went on writing. In 1931 he was already so far advanced as to come out with a criticism of *Abuses of Democracy,* to attach himself to local and professional organizations of self-government supporters and to appeal to ancient legends. As one sees, he was marching in step. But with whom? With Hitler and Goebbels.

In 1933 the German workers, whether they were Socialists or Communists, were routed by the fascist bandits, thrown into concentration camps, murdered. The books of the finest minds were burned on funeral pyres. But de Man's works were protected by Goebbels as was de Man himself, watching peacefully and unmolested from his Darmstadt study these events, without his "social" conscience being touched. Yes, he can describe himself as the only "Socialist" who, under the fascist dictatorship of Hitler, was invited to continue his lectures at the University of Frankfurt. Thus under Hitler appeared his second great work, *The Socialist Idea.* In this he called for the dissolution of legislative assemblies and the placing in power of commissars with extensive

personal authority. This is what Hitler did in practice.

De Man returned later to Belgium in order to develop his notorious "plan." The *Peuple* of December 1, 1933, reported of him that he was sympathetically taken up in circles of finance and heavy industry. And in order to disperse all doubts about his character de Man described himself, in the *Peuple*, as a "safety-valve." That was, and is, the substance of the "practical socialism" which de Man presents to the workers as Columbus' egg.

Then came the time when, because of the capitulation of the Western democracies, Hitler's threat to the small states became more and more serious. Instead of supporting collective security more strongly, de Man and Spaak supported a policy of "neutrality" for Belgium, in which they named the bourgeois democratic states and the fascist dictatorship in one breath and went on to flirt quite openly with the fascist dictatorship.

The Munich betrayal followed. De Man published an article in the issue of the *Peuple* of October 31, in which, with assertions that mock at historical experience, he spoke on behalf of an understanding with the fascist robbers. He called for nothing more nor less than capitulation to fascism. He demanded this in the name of that "freedom," which fascism has always destroyed wherever it has been victorious. Until now, only those people have urged this who were consciously playing into the hands of fascism and who openly made known their sympathy with it.

At the Belgian Socialist Party Conference, Spaak and de Man went a step further. They again spoke in favor of recognizing Franco and even went so far as to assert that this would be in the interests of the country. But for de Man and Spaak the interests of the Belgian working class and of the mass of the Belgian people are not the interests of the country.

In order to defend the policy of Spaak's government, de Man asserted even that its activity was concerned with "sacred interests of the working class." De Man apparently sees such a "sacred interest" in the handing over of German anti-fascists to their executioners. Finally, de Man went so far as to demand that in "necessary cooperation" with the fascist states, the Belgian people should make necessary sacrifices. The peoples of Czechoslovakia have only just learned the nature of these sacrifices: loss of independence and freedom, dismemberment of the country, fascist slavery. Of such a nature are the ideas of the "freedom" which Spaak and de Man defend.

Henri de Man speaks continually of "socialism." But today the word "socialism" in his mouth means no longer the demand that the worker should behave himself politely, but the demand that he shall not resist fascism. The blood-dripping hands of the German fascists appear to the scion of the bourgeoisie less dreadful than formerly the "unwashed" hands of class-conscious miners appeared. As a youth, Henri de Man set out to conquer Marxism. Ideologically he became a forerunner of fascism. His way leads to Hitler Germany, his aim is the surrender of the working class before the fascist aggressor.

The Munich Conspiracy and the Dutch

THE dismemberment of Czechoslovakia caused the greatest uneasiness in all the small states in Europe. In Holland, too, the earthquake of European politics is being felt more and more plainly. Until after the World War, the Dutch bourgeoisie carried on a so-called policy of independence. After the war, the Dutch bourgeoisie turned towards the League of Nations and undertook the obligations of the League Covenant. Inside the bourgeois camp there were two tendencies with roots in the past, one towards England and the other towards Germany.

The leading group, up to now, finance and colonial capital, has been the one which looked to England. The group which looked to Germany has, during the past few years, created and supported the fascist party in Holland. This party has the closest connections with German fascism.

In the face of the threats of German fascism, which regards Holland as a "Border German" region, and the Japanese advances towards the East Indies, the widest circles in Holland calmed themselves with the assumption that England would never permit Holland to be seriously endangered. Had not the English Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin (now Lord Baldwin), declared shortly before that the frontiers of England were on the Rhine?

This mood has been profoundly shaken by the Munich conspiracy. The leading section of the Dutch bourgeoisie supported Chamberlain. In the fateful days of Munich the government withdrew still further from the policy of collective security because this, as the Foreign Minister declared, might lead to "great conflicts."

At the League of Nations Assembly, the Dutch delegation declared for "neutrality" and against the retention of the obligatory character of Article 16 of the Covenant of the League. This attitude, which was described as a return to the so-called "policy of independence" meant, in fact, support for Hitler. At this time the government carried out no military measures; only the frontier guards were kept under arms and it was emphasized that this was the case not only on the German but also on the Belgian frontier.

It was only a day before the conversations at Munich that a further partial mobilization was carried out. Parliament was not summoned and was not able to discuss the change in foreign policy. Only when the mobilization took place was there a short session to approve credits for this purpose. The bourgeois opposition to the reactionary government was very weak. The Social-Democratic Party also approved the credits.

The fascist wing of the bourgeoisie and the fascist party produced the slogans: "Holland must be the bridge between Germany and England." "A North German Alliance must be created." None the less, after the dismembership of Czechoslovakia there was great concern even among adherents of the fascist party. The leader of the fascist party, Musert, saw himself compelled to send the Premier, Hendrik Colijn, a telegram in which he declared himself ready "to defend national independence against all attacks."

While a great part of the bourgeoisie turned as before to Chamberlain, among the masses there arose ever-increasing opposition to the traditional policy.

For this reason the two historical groupings of the bourgeoisie, the one

looking towards England and the other towards Germany, united in an attack on the democratic rights of the masses and especially on the working class. The victory of German fascism aggravated the general reactionary tendency in the bourgeoisie. One section of the reactionary Catholic press demanded that the bourgeois-democratic parties take the example of Munich to heart and come to an "agreement" with the Musert party. The rapidly ripening economic crisis also plays a great part, driving sections of the bourgeoisie, for whom Colijn's policy of deflation does not go far enough, in the direction of fascism.

Opposed to this fascist development of the bourgeoisie is the anti-fascist development of the vast mass of the common people.

During the European crisis the Dutch people showed an extraordinary interest in politics. The attitude of the masses turned against German fascism, which they regarded as provoking war. The illusion that Holland was a peaceful island amid the towering waves collapsed. Among all groups of workers there was being born a determination, hitherto unknown, to defend the independence of the country. National and democratic sentiments were strongly manifest in the army, too, where the majority of soldiers did not conceal their enmity to German fascism, and a number of officers took up a democratic attitude.

Against this there were, of course, other sentiments—fear of war, and petty-bourgeois hopes that Holland, by remaining neutral, might avert the danger.

The working class was more conscious than before that the workers and the mass of the people must unite in order to check fascism. None the less, great sections of the working class were not clear that the government's policy was assisting fascism. The general feeling of relief after Munich was followed first by disappointment which, in the face of the persecutions of the Jews in Germany, rose to passionate animosity.

In the critical Munich days, Dutch Social-Democracy took up a better attitude than Social-Democratic Parties in many other countries. It opposed the foreign policy of the government and openly advocated a policy of collective security. It stigmatized the treachery of Chamberlain and Daladier, sharply criticized the policy of Faure and Blum and directed no attacks against the Soviet Union at this time. But at the same time, during these perilous days, the Social-Democratic leaders allowed no kind of united front. It did not demand the summoning of parliament although it had the opportunity to do this and it neglected to organize any mass campaign.

None the less, among the masses of the working class, Social-Democratic and Communist workers came very close to one another. Many Social-Democratic workers attended Communist meetings and declared in discussions that the necessity of unity was now clear to them.

The Communist Party appealed for unity against the fascist menace to the country, it issued a warning against Chamberlain's policy and fought against the foreign policy of the Dutch government. The parliamentary fraction issued a public declaration to the premier and demanded measures against the fascist organizations which support Hitler, democratization of the army, democratic reforms in the East Indies, defense for the civil population, work for the unemployed and increase of unemployment relief. Finally the fraction demanded the immediate summoning of parliament.

As in many other countries, so in Holland, the Munich conspiracy produced conflicting tendencies. On the one side, reactionary elements were encouraged to make new advances, on the other side, the anti-fascist movement among the masses was strengthened. In this situation it is of decisive importance that the working class should unite in order to secure the cooperation of all forces ready to defend Holland against fascism, that the working class lead the nation in its struggle for freedom and independence. It became more and more clear to the workers, to the Catholic and Jewish employees and to all honest democrats that German fascism was a direct threat

to them and that the policy of "neutrality," that is, of isolating Holland, called forth the greatest dangers. The working class is in a position to make the widest masses of the people conscious that only a government supported by all the democratic forces in the country, which cooperates internationally with all forces which resist German fascism, can maintain the independence of Holland. Such a government can find a powerful ally in the millions of the people of the East Indies if it recognizes their rights to democratic freedom and regards them as equally privileged citizens of the state. The movement of the East Indian people for solidarity with China and its movement of opposition to Japan have reached a tremendous scale. It is here that the Dutch people can multiply its forces in the struggle against the fascist menace.

The Dutch Social-Democrat Albarda condemned the foreign policy of the Dutch government and stated that the so-called Oslo Powers (Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Norway) are a power to be reckoned with once they renounce the disastrous policy of "neutrality," of capitulation to the fascist aggressors. If the Social-Democratic Party would draw the conclusions and, through working class unity and the combination of all democratic forces, would open a determined struggle for a reorganization of Dutch politics, the decisive step towards the safety of Holland would be taken. The Communist Party of Holland at all events will leave no stone unturned to bring about this political revolution.

"Of exceptional significance is the counsel of the great Lenin that the working class needs, first and foremost, to acquire *faith in its own forces*, to smash the accursed illusion that the peoples are unable to manage without the leadership of the bourgeoisie, without this class deciding their fate. *The working class must become profoundly imbued with the consciousness of the need resolutely to take the lead of the popular movement against fascism. . . .*

"Life imperatively demands that it become the task of the working class itself to get the solution to these questions. The question of war and peace must be decided by the masses of the people and primarily by the working class. The masses of the people have been regarded in the capitalist countries merely as an instrument in the hands of the ruling classes. They have been hurled into the abyss of war in the name of the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. And there is the desire once more to use them in the way that pleases the task-masters of the capitalist countries. But the working class is vitally interested not to place its fate, the fate of its country, in the hands of the ruling classes. *It is time that the wide masses of the proletariat and the people understood that in modern capitalist society there is no force other than the working class that is capable of taking on itself the leading role, the role of true, staunch and thoroughly consistent fighter against foreign fascist invasion.*"—Georgi Dimitroff, *After Munich.*

Forward on the Front of Theory!

THE Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published, towards the middle of November, a resolution entitled: "On the Form of Party Propaganda in Relation to the Publication of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*"

This resolution, which we publish in full in this issue [p. 1135], is of fundamental importance. It not only demands a reorganization of Communist propaganda in the Soviet Union, but is primarily a carefully studied rousing appeal to all Communists not to treat Marxist-Leninist theory as a thing to be preserved in museums but to employ it as our most important instrument of struggle.

The unity of theory and practice, the harmony between revolutionary knowledge and revolutionary action, has always been the "secret" at the basis of the historical victories of the Bolsheviks. The great Party of the Bolsheviks has always transformed reality by means of the resolute application of revolutionary theory, and has always tested and retested revolutionary theory by reality, and thus developed it to higher stages.

While in the Social-Democratic Parties Marxism was like a museum piece which was only brought out on high days and holidays, in the hands of the Bolsheviks it was always a banner in the struggle, a weapon that never rusted and whose flexibility increased with its weight. As Comrade Stalin told the delegates of the Sixth Congress of the C.P.S.U., "There is a dogmatic and a creative Marxism. I adhere to the second."

The resolution of the Bolshevik Central Committee is devoted to the preservation and further development of this creative Marxism-Leninism which has not become lifelessly embedded in print, but has developed in the course of struggle.

The greatness of a Party which has built socialism upon one-sixth of the earth's surface also gives this document its definite stamp. What other party in the world so directly calls things by their right names, so openly demonstrates the errors and deficiencies in its own ranks, so candidly criticizes its own insufficiencies, so powerfully strikes at the very root of the evil and then at once drives so forcefully towards a change?

Enemies had found their way into the Party. It was to their advantage to damp down the flaming spirit of Marxism-Leninism by means of bureaucratic measures, and to replace it by dogmatism and pedantry. Lethargic bureaucrats and "purely practical people," immersed in day-to-day questions, aided them, directly or indirectly. The self-satisfaction of many comrades who, with justified pride, looked back upon the many marvelous triumphs of the Bolsheviks, but who derived from this the inaccurate conclusion that now victory was decisively assured, produced the prerequisite conditions for neglect of theoretical work, for a certain stultification of propaganda.

Many of these comrades did not keep in step with the swift development of socialism in the Soviet Union, with the growth of a new socialist intelligentsia, with the tide of new tasks and problems which beset each member of the Party. The full current of Soviet democracy was sweeping through all institutions of the Soviet state. Ever wider masses of the people were participating in the management of the state. Young Sta-

khanovites and young collective farmers were becoming directors of factories and other concerns. Millions of young people were getting a scientific education. The struggle against the enemy with a hundred disguises, the problem of the capitalist world surrounding their country, which had deeply penetrated the consciousness of the Soviet people, aroused them to the need of all-around political education. To inculcate all these people, active in the construction of socialism, with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, so that Bolshevism becomes part of the very fiber of their being—such is the definite task of the present day.

The fulfilment of this task is served by the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, and by the resolution on the form of propaganda.

The desire to learn, the bold resolution to tackle the most difficult tasks, and the firm conviction that no difficulty is insurmountable—these are the distinguishing features of the cadres of socialism in the Soviet Union. Marxism-Leninism is a science. One can make oneself thoroughly familiar with it; one can master it as one can any other science. It is nobler, more interesting and more vital than any other science.

But the approach to this science was guarded by all kinds of pedants, quibblers and pundits who juggled with quotations and paraded formulas they had learned by heart, thus discouraging and overawing people who were eager to learn. They aroused in the minds of many the idea that Marxism-Leninism was inaccessible to them, that their natural intelligence and capacities were inadequate for the mastery of this difficult subject. In this connection, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. states:

"The belief in their power and capacity to master Marxist-Leninist theory must be restored to the Communists."

True, Marxism-Leninism is not a science which one may acquire effortlessly, but every thoughtful Communist is capable of penetrating its meaning and applying its findings to his activities. And he is all the more capable of so doing when he encounters "Leninism in action," in studying the history of the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, when, gazing back into history, he realizes how theory was developed in struggle, and how the struggle of the Bolsheviks translated theory into fact. The history of his Party, in this manner, becomes for him the history of the great creative ideas of Marxism which have changed the world and which will continue to change the world.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leading Party of the Communist International, is also of great significance for the Communists and revolutionary workers in capitalist countries. Naturally one cannot mechanically apply it to the international working class movement, but one can and must utilize its essentials. Its *text* is for the Communists in the country of socialism triumphant, but its *spirit* applies to all Communist Parties.

It is the theory of Marxism-Leninism which is here concerned. Never before was it so important to strive for this theory to become part of the very fiber of all Communists, so that we may view all world events in its light and, through its brilliance, attract to us new men and new sections of society. Fascism is carrying on a barbaric war of extermination against the working class and its revolutionary science. The bloodshot mists of fascism's savage ideology are whirling over Europe. In the fascist countries, youth is brought up to brutality, ignorance and the glamor of mereticious adventure. Without realizing it, other persons are infected with this—people who are not fascists. The poison of fascist propaganda percolates even into the working class movement. The imperialistic acts of violence of German fascism, the occupation of Austria and of the Sudetenland, have been approved in principle by some Social-Democrats. German fascism's insolent claim to subjugate all German-speaking people is not opposed with sufficient force by some anti-fascists. The cancerous growth of Germany's war economy has actually been characterized by some Socialist

"theorists" as progressive. Fascism's campaigns against the Soviet Union have been directly or indirectly supported by some Socialists. In leading Social-Democratic circles, Marxism is made responsible for the defeats of the working class, a new revisionism is being preached which, in actual truth, is nothing other than ideological surrender to fascism.

While, on the one hand, fascist ideology is beginning to influence some anti-fascists, we may note, on the other, that new individuals and social strata are beginning to take a stand against fascism, and are earnestly endeavoring to feel their way through to a sound anti-fascist ideological standpoint. We may observe such efforts, not only among Social-Democrats, but also among democrats, Catholics and non-party people, in whom their horror of fascism has invoked deep ferment.

Many of these people regard Communism with traditional antagonism. Nevertheless, they will listen to what the Communists have to say; they have not made up their mind from the outset to reject Communism lock, stock and barrel. They are receptive to any light which may show them the path from out of the darkness of fascism. Rarely has there ever previously existed such ideological confusion; but rarely also were there ever so many people who were prepared to accept a new, clear ideology which pointed towards the future.

In the light of this ideological confusion, then, and this search for a sound anti-fascist ideological attitude, the Communists are faced with the great and welcome task of *developing fundamental and comprehensive propaganda for the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.* It is today no longer merely a matter of *agitation,* in order correctly and effectively to elucidate questions of the moment, but also, and to a greater extent, of *propaganda,* of the multiform and vital application of the great basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

We Communists can only fulfill this task if we are not submerged in the daily struggle, if we are able to respond to the decisive requirements of the day in all spheres of life. To be capable of this, we must study the life-work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, must familiarize ourselves with the history of the working class movement, and, above all, with the history of the Bolsheviks; we must continuously extend and deepen our knowledge.

On the importance of the fundamental study of Marxism-Leninism in the practical struggle of the proletariat and of the people, Comrade Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International said:

". . . We Communists are people of action. Our is the problem of practical struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war, the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. It is precisely this *practical* task that obliges Communist cadres to equip themselves *with revolutionary theory.* For, as Stalin, that greatest master of revolutionary action, has taught us, theory gives those engaged in practical work the power of orientation, clarity of vision, assurance in work, belief in the triumph of our cause." *

Those engaged in practical Party work must not answer that they have no time. When the great Bolshevik Kirov once asked one of these Party workers why he reads no books, the comrade replied: "I have no time. You can see how my tongue's hanging out from overwork." Smilingly, Kirov answered: "Tuck your tongue in every day for an hour, and read a good book." The division into "theorists" and "practical workers" does not represent the reality of a Communist Party. The Party of Lenin and Stalin may attribute its victories not least to the circumstance that the leading personnel of this Party—whether in the Caucasus or in St. Petersburg, in Siberia or the Ukraine, living illegally or as emigres—applied themselves with the utmost seriousness to Marxism, that they passionately discussed all theoretical questions, that in inexhaustible discus-

---

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front,* pp. 123-24, International Publishers, New York.

sion they explored and developed scientific socialism.

To read and think independently is indispensable for every active Communist. It is not enough to gain political knowledge merely from the newspapers; every active Communist must read books as well. To be able to repeat a few quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is not enough; for Marxism-Leninism is not a collection of quotations but a comprehensive and organic body of work, from which one cannot merely break off fragments, or let selected sentences stand alone. It is of little use to learn Marxist-Leninist aphorisms by heart; one must know their roots: the historical and political associations out of which they arose, the formulations of questions from which they were developed. It is the *essence* of Marxism-Leninism, rather than the *text*, which we should absorb.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stresses the importance of "creative discussion." In view of the endless volume of new problems, in view of the ideological confusion in the working class movement and the extraordinarily complicated situations which arise and change in such swift succession in the course of the struggle, such creative discussions are as indispensable as the very air we breathe.

There are many questions about which the masses are not clear: questions of peace policy, of the anti-fascist struggle, of the struggle for national liberation, of the defense of democracy, and so on. In the case of many of these questions there are conflicting opinions even within the working class movement. In some of these questions, certain differences of opinion might also exist among Communists. We shall not be able to convince the hesitant, the doubters or the mistaken, if we only confront them with ready-made theses and resolutions. We can only convince them in open, frank, comradely discussion. It is only in the process of such discussion that all opinions are ventured, that we shall get to know all the incorrect arguments, that we shall learn to discover and repair this or that weakness in the presentation of our own case.

But this is not all. Nowadays discussion is going on everywhere. Larger and larger numbers of people are being stirred mentally. We Communists must participate in such discussions. We must have a sensitive ear for all questions. We must not content ourselves with stating that many of these questions have long ago been answered; we must deal patiently with them and answer them once again. And we must answer them in such a manner that the questioners understand us—we must be convincing without arrogance. Nothing is more erroneous than to reply contemptuously to a question: "This is a problem that isn't a problem. It's all in Marx and Engels already." Or to reply complacently: "Why, we Communists laid that down twenty years ago, but ignoramuses like you didn't understand us then. It's certainly taken you long enough!" Or when we expand our chests and boast: "Everything's clear to us Communists. There's not a single question to which we can't supply an immediate and definite answer."

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stigmatizes such "as harmful pedantic-administrative methods, red-tape, routine," which so frequently mar the work of the Communist study circles. But it is not only a question of these study circles; for the Communists in capitalist countries, it is a question of the methods which we should employ in approaching all people who reject fascism but who have not yet worked their way through to a clear understanding of things. Nothing can harm our cause so much as the contempt or arrogance with which we sometimes approach these people. Nothing can so repel an individual as to feel: "Here am I, worrying about this question, and then he comes along, reaches into a well-arranged drawer and pulls out a few ready-made formulas and quotations which he hands me as a solution."

We Communists are the *only people* who are able to show the masses the way out, because our theory is correct and has been tested in the severest fighting

and the greatest victories. But that does not mean that every Communist knows best in every situation, and that he has nothing to learn from non-Communists. It is precisely because our theory is correct, that we are able to dispense with all swaggering, that we can be *convincing* without acting like schoolmasters. We do not come to the masses as carping know-alls, but as *friends* who want to help them to find the right path; as *comrades* who wish to pass on to them the living doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, and who in their propaganda do not draw this teaching from abstract formulas but from present-day experiences and problems. Events themselves throw up the definite questions; and it is with these questions that we must conscientiously and objectively deal.

This comradely discussion within the whole working class movement, within the whole anti-fascist movement is the more important as today all active fighters against fascism need for their fight a firm theoretical basis. A great deal of vacillation could be avoided, many errors overcome if not only the members of the Communist Parties, but also the active members of the whole working class movement were conversant with Marxist-Leninist theory, if they acquired the ideological firmness which more than anything else gives the strength to stand up against difficult situations. Says Comrade Dimitroff:

"Correctly to combine the operation of the policy of the People's Front with the propaganda of Marxism, with the raising of the theoretical level of the cadres of the working class movement, with the mastery of the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as a guide to action—all this we must learn and teach our cadres and the masses day after day. . . . We must not allow practice to become divorced from theory, a gap to develop between the fulfillment of the urgent tasks of today, and the further perspectives and aims of the working class struggle." *

To advance ideological development not only in the ranks of the Communist Parties but in the ranks of the whole working class movement is one of the most important tasks in the present period of struggle.

In the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the fact of a "*serious backwardness on the theoretical* front" is noted. Therefore, the Central Committee has decided as follows:

"All workers on the theoretical front are called upon to abolish, resolutely, swiftly, the intolerable backwardness of the theoretical front, to overcome the fear of boldly raising theoretical questions which would further develop Marxist-Leninist theory, and to put an end to hair-splitting and quibbling, to scholasticism, and to the vulgarization and superificial treatment of particular aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory."

These decisions should apply to an even greater extent to the Communist Parties of capitalist countries. In discussion on the burning question of the anti-fascist struggle, we must pose theoretical questions boldly and determinedly; we must not remain behind theoretically. We shall not be able to convince the masses, and we ourselves will encounter severe difficulties, unless we proceed with the utmost thoroughness to construct the correct theoretical foundation of our policy of the people's front, for our attitude towards struggles for national liberation, for our correct characterization of fascism as the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist elements of finance capital, for a world anti-fascist front, and for our defense of bourgeois democracy against the attacks of fascism.

The policy of the Communist International has boldly and resolutely taken into account the new conditions of the struggle. But theoretical development is far behind political development. We have to make up a lot of ground in this sphere, in the ideological struggle against fascism, against the neo-revisionist capitulation theories within the working class movement, and against all the many errors and obscurities which so rapidly appear on every hand.

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 236.

And finally we must not overlook the fact that nowadays many of the capitulators of the Second International themselves question Marxism; that a new generation is growing up which has been subjected to the concentrated influence of anti-Marxist propaganda; that the poison of decaying capitalism has crept even into the working class; that it is of the utmost necessity *to explain the elementary bases of Marxism-Leninism* in connection with outstanding political events.

In these days, the ideological firmness of Communists, their capacity to keep step theoretically with political events, is of utmost and decisive importance. It becomes the urgent task of all Communist Parties to increase and intensify the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, to arouse the interest of Communists in theoretical problems, to encourage capable Party comrades to take up work on the theoretical front, to engender *an atmosphere of creative interchange of ideas.* Undoubtedly it is more difficult in the conditions of the struggle in capitalist countries to carry out this task, but it is not impossible. We must resolve it hard enough, and then we shall succeed.

Thanks to the victories of socialism in the Soviet Union, and because of the growing menace of fascism, the masses nowadays listen to the voice of the Communists. We shall gain their confidence all the sooner if they recognize in us, not only the bravest *fighters* of this epoch, but also the clearest *thinkers.* For this, Marxism-Leninism provides us the opportunity. It depends on us whether we make use of it.

"The Soviet Union pursues its policy in the interests of the genuine defense of world peace, in the interests of the working people of all countries. Its peace policy corresponds to the aspirations of all peoples. The Soviet Union is the powerful buttress of the struggle against wars of conquest, the unfailing defender of small nations and weak countries against fascist aggression and imperialist enslavement. In its struggle for peace the Soviet Union bases itself on the might of victorious socialism. Every new socialist factory is a new fortress in the struggle of the peoples of all countries against fascism. Every flourishing collective farm is a new blow at the dark forces of reaction. Every success of the socialist country strengthens the power of the working people throughout the world. The culture and science of the Soviet country are placed at the service of the whole of mankind. The land of socialism is the staunch bulwark of the liberation struggle of the working people throughout the world, the most important factor in rallying the forces of the international working class and of the anti-fascist people's front. *The moral and political unity of the Soviet people increases the great vital force of international solidarity among the working people.*"—Georgi Dimitroff, *After Munich.*

Pacifism or Class Struggle?

BY PETER WIEDEN

"Pacifism and abstract peace propaganda represent a form of deceit practiced on the working class." (Lenin.)

THE nations are awakening from the pernicious delusion that the Munich plot has saved peace. The doves of peace flown by Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier have assumed the form of bomber planes, the bells tolling for peace have been hurriedly recast into gunbarrels and the fascist warmongers have emerged strengthened from the witches' cauldron of the "saviors of peace."

The nations are beginning to recognize the monstrous deception practiced on them by the reactionary accomplices of fascism. They had been told that what had been at issue in Munich was the vital question of "war or peace." In order to save Europe from an imminent war, the statesmen representing the British and French bourgeoisie had, they claim, sacrificed honor, fidelity to treaties and Czechoslovakia on the altar of peace. This allegation is a flagrant untruth.

The question at issue in Munich was not "war or peace," but *"capitulation of fascism or capitulation of democracy."* The German fascists were not in a position to fight Czechoslovakia, France and the Soviet Union. General Beck, chief of the German general staff, knew very well why he resigned from his office. The information percolating out of Germany gives an idea of the disastrous situation in which Hitler found himself. There was no money, no food, no experienced military personnel. The mobilization was a miserable failure and in many instances an unholy muddle. The soldiers were unwilling and angry. They deserted in batches over the French and Czechoslovak frontiers, conveying the greetings of the German anti-fascists. The fortifications were unfinished and the German workers who were building them did not conceal that they were waiting for the French liberators to come. Mutinies revealed the rifts and cracks in the army.

The popular masses were embittered and hostile to the existing regime. The opposition was steadily gaining ground and its militancy was growing from day to day. The military and economic experts had no doubts that a war would have meant *certain defeat.* Face to face with internally disrupted German fascism stood the Czechoslovak army, inspired by the spirit of national defense and protected by almost impregnable fortifications; stood the French army, which knew that it was defending the freedom and the very existence of France; stood the mighty Red Army of the Soviet Union, incarnating the incomparable unity of a nation of 170,000,000. Such a war was hopeless for the German fascists from the very first day. They could not venture to wage such a war and would be forced to *capitulate.* And if they had ventured on it in spite of everything, German fascism would have *collapsed* after a few months on the home front and in the firing line. The German fascists knew this very well, their reactionary accomplices in France and Britain knew it very well

and that is *precisely* why the Munich plot was framed.

What this plot prevented was *not war but the capitulation of German fascism.* Only the gifts of the reactionary British bourgeoisie and of its French counterpart, only the increase in power which fell into the lap of German fascism without a struggle put the German fascists into a position to envisage a major war. If the forces of peace by their solid unity and by a supreme effort do not prevent this now seriously menacing war, then the nations will pay with millions of dead for the work of the Munich "saviors of peace."

It is absurd and at the same time distressing that the fear of war felt by the nations goes to increase the war danger, that pacifism is pouring oil onto the flames kindled by the warmongers, that the forces of war are lining up behind the screen of pacifist peacemongering.

Let us not close our eyes to the fact that the imperialist has succeded in exploiting *the desire of the masses for peace and has used it to prepare the way for another world war.* Let us remember that the German fascists exploited the anti-capitalist feeling of the masses in order to establish an unlimited dictatorship of capitalism. Let us teach the masses to overcome their terrible gullibility, to see through the wiles of the enemies of peace and freedom, even if they come with the words "peace and freedom" on their lips.

In 1914 the imperialist warmongers of all countries hid their sordid class interests behind the bloody smokescreen of *jingoism.* Today, however, they must take into account that millions of men and women hate war because they have experienced it themselves and must therefore have recourse to less crude methods of deception. Today it is the peace vaporings of *pacifism* with which they mislead the masses. United in their hatred of liberty, of the working class and of socialism, the fascist dictators and their reactionary accomplices in the democratic countries have it all worked out; in the countries where fascism has won power, it increases jingoism to boiling point and in the countries where the reactionary bourgeoisie must take democratic institutions into account, it attempts to paralyze the popular masses by a sanctimonious pacifism and hold them back from the struggle.

While fascism fosters the ideology of a war of conquest, the accomplices of fascism in the democratic countries attempt to set up cowardice as a philosophy. While fascism teaches its subjects slavish "obedience even unto death," its accomplices in the democratic countries attempt to make slavish non-resistance a principle of citizenship. In both cases the reactionary bourgeoisie is striving to *degrade men into slaves.*

The desire of the nations for the preservation of peace is most justified. But this desire is of little avail if those who want peace are not prepared to fight for it and not determined to defend it. The most precious possessions of mankind require the greatest determination to fight for them. An achievement for which none fight and none bring sacrifices is doomed.

No one knows this as well as the working class. The tiniest right, the most insignificant improvement had to be won by the workers by a hard struggle and at the cost of many sacrifices. Only by courage, persistence and solidarity could and can they win recognition and uphold their human dignity. Only by a heroism unparalleled in history could they do away with capitalist exploitation and oppression on one-sixth of the earth and defend their freedom against a world full of enemies. Wherever this proletarian fighting spirit dies down, wherever the enemy succeeds in lulling this militancy to sleep, there the working class is driven back and suffers bitter defeats. The strength of the working class lies in its militant intrepidity. *Struggle and again struggle is the innermost essence of the class which is destined to liberate mankind by its own emancipation and by its victory to inaugurate the real history of mankind.*

The reactionary bourgeoisie has always recognized that it was imperative for its interests to find its way into the working class movement by hook or by crook, in order to undermine the mili-

tancy of that class and carry disruption into its ranks. The reactionary bourgeoisie could no longer maintain its rule and postpone its fall except by deceiving the working class. In this it has again been successful—it has again deluded a considerable section of the working class and smuggled the policy of surrender into its ranks. In 1914 the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement engineered such a surrender by using patriotism as a stalking-horse; this time the stalking-horse was pacifism. Surrender is no better for that. Munich constitutes a defeat of the international working class. The working class owes this defeat to the direct agents of the reactionary bourgeoisie who have entrenched themselves in the leading bodies of the Labor and Socialist International and to the quaking lily-livered petty bourgeois who waved the white feather of their cowardice as a palm leaf to celebrate the "peace" of Munich. The imperialists, who have no objection to wars of conquest but who abhor wars of emancipation, suddenly discovered pacifist leanings in themselves. Their agents within the working class movement were the standard bearers of pacifism as they had been the standard bearers of bourgeois patriotism in 1914. And the choir of quaking petty bourgeois within the working class movement regarded pacifism as the back door through which they could escape the anti-fascist struggle.

Only too many workers allowed themselves to be misled.

This shows how dangerous the so-called "total pacifism" is for the working class movement and makes it necessary that serious attention be paid to it.

FREEDOM IS MORE PRECIOUS THAN PEACE

Populaire, the official daily paper of the French Socialists, published a series of articles dealing with problems of peace policy just previous to the Socialist Party congress. Some of these articles and an essay by the Belgian Socialist Henri de Man (published on October 31 by *Le Peuple,* the official paper of the Belgian Workers' Party) contain every argument used by the "total pacifists."

"The worst settlement is better than the best victory!" were the terms in which J. B. Sévérac, French Socialist, expressed the principle of unconditional surrender in its most pungent form. (*Populaire,* October 26.)

The place of the struggle against fascism is thus taken by a "settlement" with the fascist aggressor. Faced with the choice of inflicting a crushing defeat on fascism or satisfying it with a "settlement," the working class is thus to chose a "settlement." What is the meaning of this? The meaning is that the working class should of its free will give up every chance of ever beating fascism. Even Sévérac cannot suppose that fascism could ever be overthrown by peaceful means. Fascism can be overthrown by no other means except a revolutionary rising of the people; it can be beaten back only by armed resistance. And as Sévérac rejects this solution, as he considers the worst settlement better than the greatest victory won by the force of arms, what he actually advises the working class to do is to *bend the neck to the fascist yoke by a series of "settlements."*

It is obvious that the "total pacifism" of Sévérac rejects not only war but also revolution, also civil war against fascism. The Spanish working class resisted the mutiny of the generals by armed force. The civil war quickly turned into a national defensive war; armed resistance to fascism always holds a "war risk" and that is what Sévérac wishes to avoid at all cost. The Spanish working class could have averted war in Spain by a "settlement" with fascism; it could have come to an "settlement" by renouncing its liberty and submitting to the bloody dictatorship of the Spanish fascists and the foreign conquerors. The German Socialists had followed this road of "settlements" to the end. They acted according to the principles of Sévérac and in each situation preferred the worst "settlement" to the risk of a civil war and the chance of a victory over fascism. The results of these "settlements" may

be studied by Sévérac in Hitler Germany: he can see the concentration camps, the torture chambers of the Gestapo, the unprecedented slavery to which the people are subjected.

The French Trotskyists have found an even more concise expression for the Sévérac principle. They have coined the term *"Better a slave than dead!"* The diplomatic word "settlement" is reduced to its real meaning in this phrase. The proud war-cry of the Frisian peasants "Better dead than a slave!" has been turned into the degenerate cowardly "Better a slave than dead!" This contemptible principle is being put forward by the agents of the Gestapo with the object of emasculating the working class and disrupting the anti-fascist ranks. It is contrary to the innermost essence of the working class. That class exemplifies the words of Pasionaria, the great Spanish national heroine who said: *"Better die upright than live on bended knees!"* The great leaders and teachers of the working class have never been cowards who preached resignation and submission; they taught the working class that it should be resolute and militant but not that it should try to substitute "settlements" with the reactionary bourgeoisie for the class struggle. Nothing could be more welcome to fascism than this demoralizing propaganda which persuades the workers never to take up arms, lest they be tempted to use them and win a victory with them.

The working class will oppose this demoralizing propaganda with the words of Jean Zyromski, the French Socialist: *"Freedom is more precious than peace!"* (*Populaire*, October 27). But freedom cannot be defended by "settlement"—it can be defended only by a struggle in which even the "risk" of a war of emancipation must be faced.

IMPERIALIST WAR AND WAR OF EMANCIPATION

The "total pacifists" are bitter opponents of every war of emancipation. "There is no such thing as a war of emancipation," asserted Henri de Man (*Le Peuple*, October 31). Every war is "ruthless and absurd" says Sévérac (*Populaire*, October 26). And Léon Blum declared that he was speaking in the name of his party when he said: "We have definitely broken with the traditional belief come down to us from the French revolution that a war can also be the instrument of the liberation of nations or of oppressed classes" (*Populaire*, October 27).

These pacifists, as one sees, do not distinguish between an imperialist war of conquest and a revolutionary war of emancipation. Still, they dare not as yet in so many words draw the conclusions from this theory which they have long ago drawn in their actions. They dare not openly declare: "The war of emancipation which the Spanish and Chinese peoples are now waging goes against the grain and we don't want to have anything to do with them!" Henri de Man in concert with the Trotskyists develops the "theory" that the forces opposing each other today are not democracy and fascism but only "satiated" and "hungry" imperialism. It is the nature of all modern wars, says de Man, to destroy liberty everywhere, "even of those nations who allow themselves to be dragged into a war by their love of liberty."

But what about Ethiopia? Was "hungry" Italian imperialism opposed by a "satiated Ethiopian imperialism" in that war? Or was not rather the Ethiopian people waging a *national war of emancipation*, defending its national independence against an imperialist aggressor?

And what about Spain? Are "hungry" German and Italian imperialism here facing a "satiated Spanish imperialism" —or is the Spanish people perhaps waging a national war of emancipation against the imperialist aggressors? And the Chinese people—is it not waging a *national war of emancipation* against Japanese imperialism?

Henri de Man has hatched a theory too clever by half. This all too clever theory has only one little flaw: that it is invariably contradicted by the facts. *Not all wars which we experience at present are wars fought between "hungry" and "satiated" imperialism but between fas-*

cist robbers and attacked nations who are defending their freedom and independence. These nations have no other way of defending their freedom and warding off the threat of slavery except a war—but Sévérac tells them that every war is "ruthless and absurd" and Leon Blum explains to them that a war can never be the instrument of the liberation of a nation or of an oppressed class. Henri de Man for his part classifies them as nations which have allowed their love of liberty to drag them into a war and who are thereby destroying their liberty. Evidently he means to say that they would have preserved their liberty by submitting to the domination of alien fascism!

This repudiation of the war of emancipation, this mechanical division of the world into "hungry" and "satiated" imperialism leads straight to conclusions which some pacifists are dodging in an embarrassed way. But what the Social-Democrat pacifists pass over in significant silence is openly blurted out by their Trotskyist allies. M. Marceau Pivert had a poster pasted up in Paris saying that one could not sacrifice millions of human beings "for the sake of the Czechoslovakian ruling classes and in the interests of French big business." While these posters were still on the walls, the Czech Agrarians, ruthless representatives of the Czechoslovak ruling classes, were conspiring with German fascism against their own country, but the Czech *people* demanded armed resistance; French big business came to terms with the German aggressors in contradistinction to the French workers, who joined their regiments singing the "Internationale." Mr. Maxton, the buffoon of English "radicalism," made the paper of his party (the I.L.P.) declare that Britain must not defend Czechoslovakia and on October 4 he paid homage to Chamberlain in the House of Commons: "The Prime Minister in that period of time, in that limited period of time, did something that the mass of the common people in the world wanted done."

This disgraceful panegyric was given its "radical" seasoning by the statement that world peace could not be achieved within the capitalist system and on the basis of the British Empire. From the doctrine that today the antagonism between "hungry" and "satiated" imperialism took precedence over everything else, Mr. Maxton drew the logical counter-revolutionary conclusion: he applauded the "satiated" imperialist Chamberlain because he threw Czechoslovakia to the "hungry" imperialist Hitler.

But the revolutionary workers who give their support to the war of emancipation waged by the Spanish and Chinese peoples are very well able to distinguish between an imperialist war of spoliation and a revolutionary war of emancipation. The imperialists themselves, the "hungry" ones as well as the "satiated" ones, also understand very well that there are such things as wars of emancipation. According to the schedule of Henri de Man, "satiated" British capitalism ought to be opposing "hungry" German and Italian imperialism in Spain—and behold, "satiated" British imperialism is to the contrary supporting "hungry" German and Italian imperialism *against* the fighters for Spanish liberty. So it appears that after all there are in this world of ours certain other, deeper antagonisms than those between "hungry" and satiated" imperialists!

Marxism has always distinguished between imperialist wars of spoliation and revolutionary wars of emancipation, between *just* and *unjust* wars. Marx and Engels were by no means of the opinion that every war was "ruthless and absurd"; on the contrary they thought that even war could in certain circumstance be the instrument of the liberation of nations and oppressed classes. Lenin developed this idea to greatest clarity and perfection. In his polemic against Rosa Luxemburg ("About the Junius pamphlet") he refuted in a masterly way the thesis that national wars were no longer possible in the era of unfettered imperialism. He showed how national wars can turn into imperialist

wars and imperialist wars into national wars. He explained that in the circumstances of a general retrogression in Europe as a result of the weakness of the working class, great national wars were quite possible even in Europe. He pointed out that national wars of colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism were not only probable but inevitable. He added:

"National wars against imperialist powers are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable, they are progressive and revolutionary."

According to the schedule of the "total pacifists" there are only imperialist states in existence and every modern war must be an imperialist war. Lenin's genius for grasping realities scattered these figments of the brain and proved that even the participation of imperialist states in a war need not of necessity give that war the character of an imperialist war. He convincingly illustrated this contention by a historical example:

"In the Seven Years War England and France fought for colonies, *i.e.*, they waged an imperialist war (which is possible on the basis of slavery or of primitive capitalism as well as on the present basis of highly developed capitalism). France was beaten and lost part of her colonies. A few years later the United States of North America begin their war of emancipation against England alone. France and Spain, who themselves possess territories which now form part of the United States, because of their hostility to England, *i.e.*, by reason of their imperialist interests, conclude a pact of friendship with the states which have risen in arms against England. French troops in cooperation with the Americans defeat the English. We have here a national war of emancipation, in which the imperialist rivalry constitutes an additional element without serious significance—in contrast to what we saw in 1914-16 (the national element in the Austro-Serbian war had no serious significance compared with the all-important imperialist rivalries). This shows how senseless it would be to apply the term imperialism indiscriminately and then deduce from it the 'impossibility' of national wars."

It is precisely this mechanical application of the term imperialism which leads the "total pacifists" to the false conclusion, entirely contrary to facts, that wars of emancipation are no longer possible today and that wars are only possible between the "hungry" and the "satiated" imperialists. The object of this theory is to divert the workers *from regarding the struggle between the forces of socialism and democracy on the one hand and the forces of fascism and its reactionary accomplices on the other as the deepest, historically decisive antagonism of our time.* The fighting spirit of the workers is to be broken by persuading them that in our epoch every war must bear an imperialist character, *i.e.*, be hostile to the interests of the working class. Their solidarity with the Spanish and Chinese fighters for liberty, with the nations subjugated or threatened by fascism, is to be degraded to the level of charity functions by telling them that in no circumstances can a war be an instrument of emancipation.

Henri de Man asks: "Can war be taken into account as a means to bring about a victory of liberty in Europe?" His answer is: "No!" He bases this "No" on the contention that war would of necessity transform all states into "authoritarian and totalitarian" states and thus destroy liberty. The same contention is to be found in the article of the French Socialist Robert Lazurick: "War would be the end of liberty. It would deliver up our country to a totalitarian regime under which life would no longer be worth living" (*Populaire*, October 28). In the same strain the French Socialist Louis L'Heveder says that in war there is neither freedom nor democracy (*Populaire*, October 31).

The representatives of "total pacifism" have obviously agreed on this point. According to their argument the nations, in order to prevent an "authoritarian or totalitarian" regime of warfare, should surrender of their own volition to fascism. In other words they should commit suicide for fear of death.

According to this argument the Spaniards and Chinese ought to have submitted to the fascist aggressors without a struggle—because a war might put democracy in jeopardy. Such is the logical conclusion of "total pacifism." The German Socialists found it necessary to demolish democracy in order to preserve it from breaking down—the "total pacifists" go even further and advocate surrender to fascism, because "life would not be worth living" in a democracy restricted through war. Obviously life is "better worth living" under fascism.

It is most characteristic that these "total pacifists" carefully avoid using the expressions "fascist states" or "fascist regime" and mention only "totalitarian states" and "authoritarian regimes." The explanation is that they class the Soviet Union as a "totalitarian" state and obviously regard the Spanish People's Front government as an "authoritarian" regime. Henri de Man and his friend Spaak have up to the present never hesitated to advocate the restriction of democracy and the "authoritarian" conduct of the affairs of state—but they appear to fear that a war of emancipation against fascism might not lead to a strengthening of *their* authority and that the people in arms might be in a position to enforce its *own* authority. For it is by no means true what these "total pacifists" affirm—that a national war of emancipation against fascist aggression must of necessity destroy democracy.

Let us keep to reality instead of the schedules of the "total pacifists." *The war of emancipation in Spain* has strengthened and stabilized the democratic institutions of the republic; in the whole of capitalist Europe there is today no government even approximately as democratic as the Spanish People's Front government.

The war of emancipation in China has compelled the Kuomintang to agree to a far-reaching democratization of the country. The authoritarian regime in Austria, when it considered armed resistance to Hitler Germany, granted part of the democratic demands put forward by the working class. Czechoslovakia was never as democratic as in the days when the people swept away the Hodza government and demanded a national war of emancipation against Hitler Germany. Experience up to the present has by no means confirmed the contentions of the "total pacifists" but has rather shown that one is far more justified in assuming the contrary. It is probable that every national war of emancipation against a fascist aggressor leads to a *consolidation of democracy*, if for no other reason than because the democratic system is more efficient in war than the fascist system; if for no other reason than because it is easier to win a victory under the flag of democracy than under the flag of tyranny; if for no other reason than because a people in arms is able to defend its freedom against treason at home as well as against the enemy at the front. What is decisive is whether such a war against a fascist aggressor is waged as an anti-fascist war of emancipation or as an imperialist war, as a war for the conquest of foreign countries and the subjection of foreign peoples. The reactionary British and French bourgeoisie would object far less to an imperialist war against Germany and Italy than to an anti-fascist war of emancipation. They are afraid not of war in itself but only of a war bearing the imprint of an anti-fascist popular movement. In order to wage a war to their own liking they would first have to subdue the forces of liberty in their own countries and substitute the blind intoxication of chauvinism for the anti-fascist fighting determination of the people. The prevention of such a development is one of the foremost tasks of the working class. But the working class will not be able to prevent it if it listens to the whisperings of the "total pacifists," if it is prepared to surrender to fascism and by so doing to leave power in the hands of the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialist cliques, without striking a blow.

Zyromski, the French Socialist leader, was right in saying that the working class has less to lose in a war against a

fascist aggressor than under a universal regime of fascism which was victorious because democracy surrendered. (*Populaire*, October 27.) It is far worse to endure the regime of concentration camps, of fascist oppression and humiliation than to fall in the struggle for freedom.

THE INTERNATIONAL STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

The revolutionary workers do not reject war in all circumstances. They distinguish between imperialist wars and wars of emancipation. They put freedom above peace. But they are determined to defend peace. They do not regard another world war as inevitable. But they are well aware that surrender to the fascist aggressors does not save peace but leads step by step into another world war.

Under what conditions can another world war be avoided? That is the question now facing the nations. In order to give a correct answer to this question one must not allow oneself to be misled as to the nature of fascism.

The profound and dangerous confusion created in the working class by "total pacifism" is based mainly on *illusions as to the nature of fascism.*

If one considers the expedients recommended by the pacifist quacks one can understand the amazement of the French Socialist Lebas at the fact that these people discuss the question of peace as if fascism did not exist. What should one do to protect oneself from a mob of gangsters? Pretend that they are not gangsters at all, establish friendly relations with them, put no obstacles in their way. That is the trend of the advice the "total pacifists" give to those faced with fascist aggression.

"Good relations must be established with all nations, not only with a few!" preaches Sévérac. (*Populaire*, October 26.) "In order to escape war one must keep peace with all nations!" is the oracle of Henri de Man. (*Populaire*, October 31.) The German poet Friedrich Schiller was a far more clear-sighted politician than these pacifist preachers when he coined the phrase: "The mildest cannot live in peace if the truculent neighbor does not want to." Good relations cannot be established unilaterally and most fervent desire of keeping the peace with all states remains quite ineffective if some of these states are determined to subjugate their neighbor states. If Henri de Man and Sévérac expect that their recipe will save peace, let them amicably persuade the German, Italian and Japanese aggressors to withdraw their troops from Spain and China and keep the peace with all nations; their quack remedy would be just about as effective as if one tried to cure rabies with smelling salts.

The disastrous argument of the "total pacifists" is most clearly expressed in the warning uttered by the French Socialist Lazurick: *"Let us beware of transferring our domestic anti-fascism into the international sphere!"* (*Populaire*, October 28.) At a time when the fascist aggressors attack foreign countries, Lazurick dares to describe fascism as the "domestic concern" of the several states. It was not the Spaniards who transferred their interior anti-fascism to the international sphere; it was the German and Italian fascists who transferred not only fascism, but soldiers, guns and airplanes to Spain. But Lazurick and his friends pretend to be blind and deaf; they make believe that the fascist states are concerned only with their own domestic affairs; they behave as if the fascist states had not the remotest intention of interfering with the internal affairs of other countries and as if the danger of international high-handedness came from the democracies and not from the fascist states.

Austria never interfered with the internal affairs of Hitler Germany—and yet she was attacked and subjugated by Hitler Germany. Czechoslovakia refrained to a point almost suicidal from opposing German fascism—and yet she was attacked and dismembered by German fascism. German fascism preaches a crusade against democracy. It talks of its "vocation," which is to exterminate "Bolshevism" in all countries. It has de-

manded and enforced the resignation of British Cabinet Ministers, the dismissal of Danish editors, the confiscation of foreign newspapers. It is organizing irredentist movements in Alsace-Lorraine, in Denmark, in Lithuania, in Poland as it did previously in the Sudeten area. It has set on foot conspiracies and putsches in Austria, in Rumania, in Brazil. It is arming the French Cagoulards. It describes the "rearrangement of Europe" as its historical task. And in the face of these monstrous fascist attacks on the security of all nations and states. in the face of this world offensive of fascism, these pacifists of the de Man and Lazurick kind come and urge the adherents of democracy not to transfer their anti-fascism into the international sphere!

These pacifist importunities are *a deliberate distortion of facts, a deliberate deception of the working class.* They all have the same trend: the contention that in our world today the antagonism between hungry and satiated imperialism is the decisive factor; the insolent assimilation of the socialist Soviet Union and the fascist aggressors under the elastic description of "totalitarian and authoritarian states"; the negation of the possibility of wars of emancipation and finally the rascally insinuation that at bottom it is democracy which is endangering world peace—all this fits together into a system which misrepresents the facts and assists fascist propaganda.

The working class must understand that the world has changed radically since 1914. What is decisive today is not the antagonism between "hungry" German and Italian imperialism and "satiated" British and French imperialism, *but the antagonism between the forces of socialism and democracy whose strongest support is the Soviet Union, and the forces of fascism and reaction who regard Hitler Germany as their policeman.*

Doubtless there are also serious antagonisms between the imperialist states; these antagonisms as well might undoubtedly blow up in a warlike clash—but they will always be overshadowed by the antagonism between the Socialist and democratic movement, on the one hand, and the reactionary bourgeoisie on the other. The war of 1914 began as a war of conquest in which two groups of imperialist states came into collision—the present war started in a completely different way: as the attack of a group of fascist states on peoples who are defending their freedom and independence. From the very beginning and in a very high degree *it shows the characteristics of a counter-revolutionary war, with the imprint of a civil war, of a class struggle*: the Spanish reactionaries are fighting side by side with the fascist aggressors against the Spanish people; reactionary sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie support the foreign Japanese enemy against the Chinese people.

The fronts run right across the countries; while wide sections of the British and French working classes regard themselves as allies of the Spanish republic, the reactionary cliques of Britain and France conspire with the fascist aggressors against the Spanish republic. While the workers and wide sections of the working population of all countries take sides with the Soviet Union, important parts of the reactionary bourgeoisie in all countries favor the counter-revolutionary machinations directed against the Soviet Union. The governing circles of "satiated" British imperialism see their chief enemy not in the "hungry" German and Italian imperialisms but in the Socialist and democratic movement whose strongest support is the Soviet Union.

The "total pacifists" of the kidney of a Lazurick urge the workers to limit themselves to the class struggle *within* their own country and not to transfer their anti-fascism into the international sphere. Thus, the French workers are asked deliberately to overlook the fact that the reactionary section of the French bourgeoisie allies itself with foreign fascism in order to be able to carry on the class struggle against the industrial and other workers of their own countries to greater effect. They are deliberately to overlook the fact that

German fascism arms the French fascists and that not a hair on the heads of these mercenaries kept by Hitler Germany within the frontiers of France is touched. They are deliberately to overlook the fact that the anti-working class speeches and measures of Daladier are immediately linked up with the Munich conspiracy and that the surrender to Hitler is accompanied by an attack of the reactionary French bourgeoisie on the French working class.

How can the danger of fascism be averted from France if one surrenders to German fascism? How can the workers carry on the class struggle against the 200 families if they disregard the fact that the 200 families are linked up with German fascism? *How can one defend democracy against the attacks of its enemies at home if one offers no resistance to the foreign allies of those enemies?* "Take no notice of the fire in the next house! Take no notice of the wind which blows the flames your way! For God's sake beware of leaving your house to help in the street in checking the spread of the fire!" Such is the advice given to the working class by the "total pacifists."

To tell the workers, in the face of an international conspiracy of fascism and reaction against the working class, democracy and socialism, that they should on no account regard the class struggle as an international struggle, that they should retire within their own four walls and there wait in complete isolation until the united gangsters break into their house—*that is a barefaced betrayal of the interests of the working class!*

HOW CAN PEACE BE SAVED?

How, then, can peace be saved?

"Best of all through weakness," say the pacifist "saviors of peace." "All one needs to do is to weaken and isolate oneself, and then peace is saved."

Nothing could be more dangerous, says Henri de Man, than to bar the way to fascism with an overwhelming superiority of military forces on the side of democracy. That leads straight to war. "That means playing with fire without thinking of a conflagration." (*Le Peuple*, October 31.) Sévérac seconds him: "Good understanding with everyone, alliance with none!" (*Populaire*, October 26.) For, he adds, every alliance involves the danger of having to wage a war for which one is not oneself responsible. Every military alliance increases the sense of power of a nation and hence makes it less cautious and less inclined to prefer settlements to solutions by violence. In other words, the more a nation is isolated, the weaker it is, the better chances it has to escape a fascist attack. Up to the present, it is true, the fascist aggressors have shown a persistent leaning towards attacking weaker opponents and turning tail before stronger ones—but the "total pacifists" obviously believe in miracles and are expecting the fascists to be converted to new principles. They believe that the German fascists would be so moved if France mutilated herself of her own accord, that in their emotion they would fall round the neck of France instead of springing at her throat. The French Socialist Lebas is of a different opinion, however; he says what all those think whose brains have not been crushed by the juggernaut of fascism: "To run away from the risk of war means that France will have to face the cannibals on her Eastern frontier in *isolation*." (*Populaire*, October 29.)

Even the "total pacifists" cannot seriously believe that German fascism, which has made a specialty of killing defenseless opponents, would respect weakness more than strength. As we do not regard them as babes in arms but as men who after all should be able to estimate consequences, we cannot but see behind their proposals the intention of weakening and isolating the democratic states to such an extent that they would no longer be able to offer any resistance and of avoiding war by submitting to German fascism without a struggle and without conditions.

While some of them oppose *all* alliances, others advocate an alliance with Hitler Germany, *e.g.*, L'Heveder, who is openly sponsoring a Franco-German al-

liance. As if in consolation he adds that there was no need for France to approach Germany "in a shirt with a rope round her neck, ready for every humiliation and slavery." Obviously the circles of the "total pacifists" are not excluding even such possibilities; seeing that they consider the "worst settlement" better than a victory! The way in which German fascism observes "bilateral treaties" was demonstrated to the world by the occupation of Austria. How it treats states which offer no resistance was experienced by Czechoslovakia.

The true motive behind these absurd proposals is being revealed more or less openly: the pacifists of the Sévérac and L'Heveder type want to do away with the *pact of friendship existing between France and the U.S.S.R.* Sévérac declares shamelessly: "Would we have had the war in 1914 if we had not been bound to Russia by a military alliance?" L'Heveder, with unprecedented cynicism, applies the justified criticism leveled by Jaurès at the imperialist pact with tsarist Russia to the pact of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R.; this pact makes France run the risk of having to go to war "for some Bulgars or others."

These pacifist men of honor know as well as everyone else that France treated the pact of friendship with Czechoslovakia like a scrap of paper while the Soviet Union indicated to the very last its readiness to comply with the terms of the pact. They know as well as anyone else that *it is not the Soviet Union which needs the help of France but France which needs the help of the Soviet Union.* The by no means Left-wing Socialist Lebas stated the true facts when he said: "France had a system of alliances which appeared to all to give a most serious guarantee of peace for France and everyone else. Of all this nothing is left. The signature of France has lost much of its value. . . . The French people, shut in between Italian and German fascism, threatened from the Pyrenees, needs such pacts of assistance for her security more than any other nation." Zyromski has stressed the decisive significance of such pacts of assistance and described the pact with the Soviet Union as an important stage in the process of combining the forces of France, the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States. He pointed out that France is interested in collective security *more than any other state.*

In fact *German fascism has effected its conquests always on the line of least resistance.* Its fear of any major war is obvious. Before a strong opponent it habitually retreats: witness May 21, 1938. And that being so, the pacifist calamity-howlers try to persuade France to castrate herself because that would induce the German fascists to attack not weak France but the mighty Soviet Union in the plenitude of its strength. German fascism would hardly oblige them to that extent; it would undoubtedly prefer to attack a weak France instead of exposing itself to the blows of the Red Army.

The pacifists who seek salvation in the weakness of democracy have no difficulty in finding the right means of weakening democracy as much as possible. As they wish the democratic states to be weak, it is no more than logical that they advocate *concessions to the fascist aggressors "to the extreme limit."* They hasten to outbid even the demands of Hitler Germany with their offers. L'Heveder is all for satisfying all colonial claims of Hitler Germany and in addition "to revise certain problems of the national minorities," *i.e.*, the "problems" which are of interest to German imperialism. Lazurick on the other hand thinks that Europe should be given up to fascism and that France should compensate herself by directing her "national dynamism" towards the colonies. All of them, including Léon Blum, are for concessions "to the extreme limit" without, however, defining these limits.

"There is a limit to what is acceptable," declared Léon Blum and added: "War becomes inevitable when the integrity of the territory, the independence of the state, the liberty of the citizens are being attacked." (*Populaire*, October 27.)

These words are by no means unequiv-

ocal. Sévérac tried to formulate it with greater precision. He said that the party would issue a call to resistance "if material violence is offered to France" (that is, airplanes over Paris or foreign armies in French territory). Only in that event and in no other should war be waged. When he says "France" he thinks "only of the great historic reality to which Frenchmen are attached inasmuch as they are free." (*Populaire*, October 26.) It must be admitted that all this sounds as obscure as an oracle from Delphi. It must further be admitted that these words are capable of a variety of interpretations in every situation. We have experienced all this before: the German and Austrian Social-Democrats were indefatigable in hatching out such "limits of the acceptable." But as reality never took into account these schedules, the "limits of the acceptable" were continually revised—until fascism was strong enough to step over them without risk and establish its own rule. The limits of "extreme concessions" are drawn not by figments of the brain but rough reality and when they are reached they are no longer capable of being defended. *For every fresh concession again modifies the balance of forces; the attacked party grows ever weaker and the aggressor ever stronger.* The result of this policy of surrender is inevitably that the day arrives when it is no longer the attacked side which defines "the extreme limit" but the aggressor who dictates it. When Czechoslovakia gave up her fortifications to the German aggressor, many politicians spoke of a "second line of defenses" which would be held in all circumstances. They never came to man this "second line of defenses." They no longer had the strength to do so. The "extreme limit" no longer depended on their wishes but on the will of the fascist aggressor.

Léon Blum seems to have felt on what unsafe ground one ventures if one tries to define the "extreme limits" of concessions. He pointed out that "owing to the crisis last month," as he cautiously circumscribed the Munich betrayal, the integrity and independence of the French nation were threatened, though not "*directly*," only "*indirectly*." He brought up the question of "indirect national defense" but did not answer it. (*Populaire*, October 29.) The French working class will have to answer this question very seriously. France has sacrificed her allies in Central Europe. She is about to throttle the Spanish republic. The reactionaries of France, supported by the "total pacifists" in the Socialist Party, are demanding the termination of the pact with the Soviet Union. Further "concessions" are under consideration. All this weakens and isolates France to such an extent that she might one day be placed in the position either of accepting a challenge in the most unfavorable circumstances or of submitting to German fascism without a struggle. By continuing the policy which led from "non-intervention" in Spain to the capitulation of Munich and now leads towards further concessions and surrenders, France might one day no longer be in a position to draw an "extreme limit" but would be compelled to leave the fixing of limits to the German fascists.

Should the workers then advocate a "*preventive war*"? No, the point is not to wage a "preventive war," but to check the fascist aggressors by a "*preventive peace*." Such a peace is still possible today.

It is possible, if the working class overcomes all pacifist illusions, if it understands that the fascist aggressors can be checked only by the strength, never by the weakness of their opponents.

It is possible if the working class unites in each country and on the international scale in order to face fascism with its combined might everywhere.

It is possible if the working class is determined to defend its freedom by the force of arms, as did the Spanish fighters for liberty, and that not only against fascism at home but also against every fascist aggressor.

It is possible if the united working class allies itself at home and on the international scale with all those forces which are prepared to defend the freedom of their people and the independence

of their country by every means at their command and in all circumstances—and if together with these forces the working class establishes governments of determined anti-fascist national defense in the place of the governments of national betrayal.

It is possible if all democratic nations, all nations menaced by fascism ally themselves with the great Soviet people in order to erect a defensive barrier of armed and determined nations against fascist aggression.

It is possible if the fascist aggressors see before them an overwhelmingly superior bloc of democratic states, which would be given irresistible force and power of attraction by the adhesion of the Soviet Union.

Thus and *only* thus can peace be saved.

The working class will not be able to fulfill this historic mission unless it gets rid of the agents of the bourgeoisie who spread the germs of disruption and surrender in its ranks, unless it drives out the hypocritical pacifists and *proceeds to organize anti-fascist peace in the spirit of the proletarian class struggle.*

"Pacifism and abstract peace propaganda are forms of misleading the working class." (*Lenin.*)

These words of the greatest revolutionary leader of the working class are highly topical today. We fight for peace—not by "settlements," by concessions, by capitulations, by pacifist sleeping-draughts, but with proletarian intrepidity, firmness, determination and solidarity.

READINGS FOR THE LENIN MEMORIAL

Following is a selected list of pamphlets for reading and study in relation to Lenin Memorial Day, January 21:

By V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism*, 30c.; *State and Revolution*, 10c.; *"Left-Wing" Communism*, 25c.; *The Teachings of Karl Marx*, 15c; *Women and Society*, 10c.; *On the Eve of October*, 5c.; *A Letter to American Workers*, 3c.; *Lenin on the Jewish Question*, 5c.; *Lenin on the Woman Question*, 5c.

By Joseph Stalin: *Lenin*, 10c.; *The Lenin Heritage*, 3c.; *Foundations of Leninism*, 10c.

By Earl Browder: *Lenin and Spain*, 1c.; by Maxim Gorky: *Days With Lenin*, 25c.; by N. K. Krupskaya: *Memories of Lenin*, in two volumes, each 75c.

The Policy of the Labor and Socialist International, and the Fascist Offensive

BY KURT FUNK

FOR most workers, including the majority of the Social-Democratic workers, the events which led to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia were an occasion for very serious thought. It was not by chance that all those who are true to the cause of the working class turned their attention to Spain immediately after Munich. They all felt that it was on that point that the next dangerous move of fascism and of their accomplices in the bourgeois-democratic countries was to be expected. All sincere friends of the Spanish republic harbored no doubts that if another violation of a country wrestling for its liberty was to be prevented, immediate and uncompromising conclusions would have to be drawn from the events which led to the Munich Agreement and these conclusions made the basis of immediate action.

Shortly after the Munich agreement José Diaz wrote in an article, the ideas of which were welcomed by all active anti-fascists:

"It is necessary that we should examine these happenings immediately in greatest detail and consider all they involve. We must mercilessly point out and eliminate our own mistakes. In the history of the class struggle there are many defeats which were not followed by the demoralization of the masses and the decline of the working class movement because they served as eye-openers to the exploited classes and showed them the way to resistance and to new victorious struggles."

Without a doubt there exist within the working class the prerequisites for the prevention of any demoralization or decline of the working class movement, and the possibilities for the strengthening of its forces as the result of a serious examination of the position.

Georgi Dimitroff described the feeling among the working people and the conditions for a successful struggle against fascism in these terms:

"Never yet, since the end of the world imperialist war, has the hatred felt for the warmongers been so profound and strong as at the present time. A wave of popular indignation against the vile deeds of fascism is rising in all countries. . . .

"It would be difficult in post-war history to find another such moment as the present one, when the interests of the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, when the nterests of the small nations, of the lependent and colonial countries, when the interests of culture and science, the nterests of peace and democracy so coincided and merged in a common current gainst fascism, the worst enemy of nankind. *This is quite a real basis for he establishment of the united front of the working class and of the peoples of ll countries against fascist barbarism nd the incendiaries of imperialist war.*" *

If it were now only a question of the workers coming to an agreement with egard to the next joint steps to take,

* G. Dimitroff, *After Munich*, pp. 13-4, 20, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

if real representatives of the working masses of all countries were to meet with the intention of discussing how to coordinate and united their forces, then only a short time would be needed for rallying and organizing the forces capable of materially weakening and repulsing fascism.

But as yet no such clear situation exists. It would avail us little to close our eyes to the fact that the attack of fascism coincides with an attack in progress within the working class movement itself against the most elementary and fundamental principles of the proletarian class struggle and the tenets of Marxism. The documents issued recently by the Labor and Socialist International, the congresses held by various parties affiliated to that body, and the discussions conducted in the columns of Social-Democratic newspapers prove that influential Social-Democratic politicians are implanting, fostering and developing bourgeois tendencies within the working class movement. We are witnessing the ideological disarmament of Social-Democracy in the face of the fascist offensive. We see that the open enemies of Marxism within the working class movement are given every facility to develop their activities.

Cowardly surrender to fascism, swimming along with the others in the muddy stream of chauvinism, are at present regarded by the L.S.I. as quite acceptable, or at least something to be discussed. All this is going on while the Spanish working class, in a gigantic struggle in which Communists, Socialists and Anarcho-Syndicalists unite their efforts, is wrestling to defeat the technically far superior forces of the fascist invaders, whose intervention is given the strongest support by the attitude of those "democratic" governments which still cling to "non-intervention." All this is going on while workers, intellectuals and progressive citizens in all countries are ready to join hands in resisting fascism and helping Spain!

The leaders of the L.S.I., whose solemn councils cannot be roused from their monotonous course even by the most glaring disproportion between decisions and actions, stressed in their resolution of October 18-19, 1938, that the Social-Democratic Parties must demand "a frank explanation" from their governments so as to prevent "the persistence or recurrence of the murderous ambiguities to which Czechoslovakia has fallen a victim." The leaders of the L.S.I. did not go so far as to name these "murderous ambiguities" directly. They are too fond of ambiguities themselves and they surrendered to the men of Munich. The Italian Socialist P. Nenni in a letter to the Belgian Social-Democratic *Le Peuple* pointed out that the sections of the L.S.I. had adopted a resolution demanding sanctions against the fascist aggressors and that next day a Socialist minister in Geneva demanded the modification of Article 16 of the League covenant, which would make sanctions against fascist aggressors practically impossible. Furthermore, the L.S.I. in a unanimous resolution demanded the end of the policy of non-intervention, "but its several sections subsequently pursued an entirely different policy," writes Nenni cautiously, and says that the contradictions existing between the resolutions of the International and the decisions of the governments of the countries in question must be eliminated.

This much is even now quite obvious: that the "ambiguities" are to be found within the L.S.I. itself. They must be openly called by their proper names in order to prevent Spain and finally the whole international working class from falling victim to these ambiguities.

WHERE DOES THE POLICY OF THE L.S.I. LEAD US?

Lêon Jouhaux, General Secretary of the C.G.T. (French Trade Union Congress) called attention to the fact (in *Messidor*, middle of October) that internal and external dangers run parallel and that it is impossible to submit to the ultimata of the foreign fascists without smoothing the way for the enemy at home. Developments in France have now taught even that section of the working population which at first allowed itself to be drugged by the peace dope so diligently handed out, that sur-

render to the blackmailing threats of foreign fascism prepared the way for the advance of reaction within the country itself. But in the discussion preceding the session of the National Council of the Socialist Party of France, certain leading Socialists put forward the suggestion that Hitler should be given what he demands, that France should break off relations with all those forces throughout the world which offer resistance to fascism, and that coming to an agreement with Hitler was perfectly compatible with the principles of Socialist policy. The unconditional "pacifism" advocated by Sévérac, L'Heveder, Chochoy and others in the final analysis leads from surrender to Hitler onward to the betrayal of the French working class into the hands of the reactionary deputies of Hitler within France herself.

The Dutch Socialist Albarda, in an article published on September 22, 1938, by *Het Volk*, gave a devastating description of the policy of surrender pursued by the Socialist ministers in the guise of "neutrality." He wrote:

"The leniency shown the fascist powers will make them even more insolent. In my opinion the small European states, especially Belgium, Holland and the four Scandinavian states, are to a very considerable extent responsible for the present situation. It seems to me to be one of the most alarming events of recent weeks that on September 13, at a time when the whole world was a prey to feverish anxiety [this was the day after Hitler made his well-known threatening speech in Nuremberg—K.F.], the governments of Holland and of the Scandinavian states declared in the League of Nations session at Geneva that they would certainly remain neutral whatever happened. . . . The German General Staff must have been very pleased. . . . And while Germany is making war on the democratic powers, she will be able to provide her armament industry with ore, steel and wood and her army with meats, dairy products and vegetables from the Scandinavian countries, Holland and Belgium. . . . The international policy of the Oslo states leads to the disruption of the power of the League of Nations to preserve peace."

With the exception of Holland all the states mentioned have governments in which the Socialists are strongly represented or head the government as the strongest party. How do these responsible Socialist statesmen justify such a policy to their supporters?

Paul Spaak, Socialist Prime Minister of Belgium—who is distinguished by a cynicism of a very special kind—at the last congress of the Belgian Workers Party (P.O.B.) gave a so-called "realistic" explanation of this sort of policy. He said that although it is a noble thing to fight for Spanish liberty, "we have something even more important to do." And what is this "more important thing"? "To fight for freedom and democracy in Belgium, answered Spaak.

Let us leave out of consideration for a moment the bourgeois cynicism with which Spaak speaks of Spain. But let us keep in mind that Spaak is prepared to give up republican Spain to Franco, in order, as he says, to preserve freedom and democracy in Belgium by so doing. Can the working class accept such a policy? Can it save freedom and democracy in its own country by such means?

In Czechoslovakia a government in which Social-Democrats held key positions recognized Franco. It was alleged that this step—which was condoned even by many honest friends of both Czechoslovakia and Spain—was taken in order to secure the assistance of Britain in resisting the attack of German imperialism. Did Czechoslovakia gain anything by abandoning Spain? It is far too obvious that this was not the case for us to say anything more about it. This was a grave step downward on the slope at the end of which stood the betrayal of Czechoslovakia to the fascist blackmailers at the instigation of Czechoslovak reaction.

Similar in its effects was the policy of blockading republican Spain, which was introduced by the Socialist-led Blum government of France. This form of favoring Franco again led only to the strengthening of reaction in France, served the immediate ends of German fascism, the chief enemy of France, and

was one of the foundations of the Munich capitulation. And to the extent to which these developments took place, the great political and social achievements of the French working class were put in jeopardy.

As for the "freedom" of Belgium which Spaak purports to defend by his policy, Albarda has already dealt with that. This freedom is the freedom to supply German fascism with material reserves and to serve as a strategic point of support for it should it so desire. The leaders of the L.S.I. recently gave us a sample of this Belgian "freedom" when they wrote in a document entitled "Information on the Situation of Political Prisoners" (October 17, 1938) that in Belgium refugees from Germany and Austria were being "questioned, arrested and deported without mercy" by the police. "Many of these unfortunates prefer to commit suicide rather than expose themselves to the appalling fate awaiting them in Hitler Germany."

Albarda, himself a Social-Democrat, wrote that the policy of the Socialist governments which have declared themselves unconditionally "neutral" meets with the full approval of German imperialism and leads to the disruption of the power of the League of Nations to preserve peace. After the statements of fact given above one may safely say that this policy also leads to the disruption of the strength of the workers in every country and thus constitutes an aid to fascism.

These Social-Democratic politicians who now advise the working class to remain within the bounds of each country and give up all international obligations (no matter whether this is done openly or in a camouflaged form) are doing the working class the worst possible service because they deprive it of the strongest weapon it possesses: international solidarity and organization. Without such international solidarity and organization the workers even in their own country are at the mercy of reaction and are unable to defend even their most elementary interests and rights. Precisely because the reactionaries and fascists are so well aware of this they spare no effort to destroy the international cohesion of the working class. The reactionaries and fascists are quite willing to tolerate and favor so-called "working class organizations" which make the defense of "professional interests" on a narrow national scale their aim. Why is it that the Socialist working class organizations have always been so sharply opposed to these yellow pseudo-working class organizations? Surely because the yellow organizations sooner or later, more or less openly, but inevitably, become instruments in the hands of the capitalists and because they hold the workers back from the class struggle. Why should it be different now, when the bourgeoisie possesses, in fascism, a very high degree of organization and concentration? Now more than at any other time circumstances urgently demand that the working class be internationally linked up and internationally active.

Karl Marx wrote in 1864 in his *Inaugural Address*, the document which served as a basis for the First International:

"Another conviction swayed that meeting. If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?" *

And Marx drew the conclusion that the duty of the working class is:

". . . to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations. The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes." *

* *Founding of the First International*, pp. 38-39, International Publishers, New York.

But if one remembers the attitude taken by the Hungarian and Polish Socialists, for instance, when their bourgeoisie, led by the most reactionary military cliques, annexed territories of democratic Czechoslovakia, then one must come to the conclusion that principles very different from these are being observed today in the Labor and Socialist International. The Hungarian Social-Democrats, in a resolution of their party executive dated October 7, acclaimed the annexation with enthusiasm and affirmed that "only this new order," *i.e.*, only this policy of annexation "could create a lasting peace." The leaders of the Polish Social-Democrats made a very similar statement in their resolution dated October 4.

The Belgian Social-Democrat Henri de Man gave as a reason for the abandonment of an international policy of the working class and the turn towards a "reconciliation" with fascism, that at the present moment he himself did not believe a revolution in Germany and Italy possible and that therefore he, instead of putting his trust "in the chimera of a revolution in Germany and Italy," was in favor of "making the necessary sacrifices." (Quoted from the congress report in *Le Peuple* of November 6-7, 1938.)

The great British Labor Party also took up the position that responsibility for Munich rests with the German people. In a message sent to the German people on September 28, the National Council of Labor declared that the British working class movement had done everything in its power and that it was now the turn of the German people to bring its influence and power to bear on the German government and restrain it from plunging Europe into a war.

After all that has happened such declarations can only be qualified as attempts to camouflage the true intentions and factual background of the policy of surrender to fascism and to the reactionary allies of fascism which is now being pursued by these Socialist leaders. They remember their internationalism only when they require a scapegoat and want to put the blame for their own guilt on someone else. In so doing they do not stop at the falsification of facts; witness de Man, who knows very well that the reactionaries of Britain and France have entered into negotiations with the fascist governments of Germany and Italy precisely because they were afraid of a further growth of the popular movement in Czechoslovakia and in their own countries, and because they had an interest in excluding the Soviet Union from the counsels of Europe and in isolating the workers' republic, and further because the fascist regime seemed to them comparatively the safest guarantee for the preservation of their own class domination.

Henri de Man and the British Labor leaders were certainly aware of the fact that the position of the fascist regime in Germany during the time of the Munich Agreement was less secure than it had ever been before and that a firm attitude of the Western powers might have consolidated the opposition in Germany to a very considerable degree. How strong the dislike of the Hitler regime is in Germany was recently shown again during the anti-Semitic pogroms, when the majority of the population took up a negative attitude and in part an openly hostile one to this feat of the Nazis. A similar state of affairs is reported from Italy. The Socialist Party of Italy, in its appreciation of the rejection of the fascist war policy by the majority of the population, has come to conclusions very similar to those of the German anti-fascists.

In these circumstances the question forcibly arises: are perhaps Henri de Man and the likes of him not in the least anxious for a revolutionary transformation of Germany and Italy? Are they afraid of a wide popular movement against fascism in the European countries? Do they, like their reactionary bourgeois backers in the democratic countries, fear a weakening of their position in such an event?

This is the situation into which the policy of the L.S.I. has already led us.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF INTERNATIONALISM TODAY?

The working class today stands in

urgent need of an international policy uniformly carried out in principle in all countries.

But there can be no question of internationalism while decisions are taken but the contrary is done.

It is not internationalism, if the Social-Democratic Parties and various trade union organizations allow themselves to be influenced by the British Labor leaders who in their own country carefully refrain from doing anything that might help the formation of a real united front against Chamberlain and seriously endanger his reactionary regime.

Nor is it internationalism when the responsible politicians of Social-Democracy attempt to put the blame on the working class of the countries subjected to fascist rule.

In the decisive days preceding Munich, the leaders of the L.S.I. observed an obstinate silence. The leading bodies of the Second International put off the working class with pompous communiques worded in the style of cabinet reports.

Such a policy brings the working class into the wake of Chamberlain and Daladier, because it deliberately refrains from using the strength of the working class for the purpose of driving forward and encouraging the hesitant bourgeois-democratic forces and checkmating the reactionary forces who are prepared to make a deal with Hitler.

What is needed today more than anything else is that the forces should be concentrated and firmly directed against the main enemy, German fascism and its allies and vassals.

Such is the basis on which the working class in each country can rally all forces sincerely desiring to defend and protect their country from the attacks of fascism. On this basis and on this basis only will the working class succeed in rallying and uniting all truly progressive forces. Progressives are at present all those who are willing to resist fascism while those who in words advocate "progress" but in their deeds promote a cowardly "humanitarian" compromise with fascism and are prepared to vegetate in the conditions magnanimously conceded by fascism must be regarded and treated as out-and-out reactionaries.

The working class will encourage and attract these progressive forces to the extent to which the workers themselves appear as an internationally unified force. But the working class will demoralize and discourage these forces if it pursues a policy such as the policy of the British Labor Party, which puts up a barrier against the union of all forces opposed to Chamberlain and which glories in the part of an inoffensive opposition, an opposition received at Court. The labor leaders who act thus are well aware of what they are doing. They are doing it deliberately. Did they not at the last trade union congress reply to the motion of the Amalgamated Engineering Union proposing that an embargo be placed on the transport of goods from Japan and other aggressor states, that that would mean a general strike, which is just what these leaders do not want?

True internationalism would exclude such a policy of "murderous ambiguities." True internationalism is governed by the desire to use the growing forces of the working class and its allies to the best purpose so that they exercise a pressure on the bourgeois-democratic governments and at the same time forestall the aggressive plans of fascism by their own action.

The Socialist and trade union workers are willing enough to pursue such a policy because the Social-Democratic workers want to fight fascism, they want to help republican Spain and they want the international working class to unite in this struggle.

THE DANGER OF DEFEATIST AND PSEUDO-REVOLUTIONARY TENDENCIES

The Social-Democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung* of Basle of October 8, 1938, had an article containing the following passage, written obviously under the immediate impression of deepest shame and discouragement after Munich:

"Now that the French Socialists under the 'glorious leadership' of Léon Blum—

whose policy is devastating the fertile lands and wonderful cities of Spain and has found its culminating point in the Munich betrayal—have given Monsieur Daladier absolution without pentinence and have on top of that granted him full powers, it seems time for the traditional Swiss sense of cleanliness to come into operation. Not another hour should we remain in an International which has for a long time been a mere shadow of itself and in which men have a decisive voice who not only approve but applaud the triumph of injustice."

However comprehensible such bitterness may be, it does not help at all. For the working class must demand more from its leading newspapers than occasional outbreaks of unbridled despondency and the repetition of impotent convulsions at all critical moments. The strength of the capitulators and of the enemies of unity within the Social-Democratic ranks consists precisely in that the forces which reject their policy have never up to the present put up a resolute and united resistance to that policy. Neither the belated and weak warnings of Vandervelde nor the helpless gestures of de Bruckère can break the brutal ambition of Spaak, for neither Vandervelde nor de Brouckère have as yet been able to make up their minds to draw the only possible conclusion, which is to take action for the unity of the working class. Up to quite recently they did the exact contrary and competed in this with Spaak himself. As recently as in the municipal elections of Brussels, Vandervelde came out against the united ticket. So what is the position from which he wants to fight Spaak, the nationalist enemy of unity?

In the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, from the ranks of which such energetic protests could be heard as the one quoted from the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, it was possible for the reactionary Ilg to foist a flagrant change in home policy on the party. Against the wishes of the majority of the members of the Social-Democratic Party, this Ilg, secretary of the Metal Workers' Federation, obtained the consent of the party to the financial projects of the bourgeoisie and thus presented the Swiss reactionaries with new powers which they are using against the working class and the small landholders. By all this he once again split the incipient democratic popular movement directed against reaction at home and the menace of German fascism. Ilg and his friends are so anxious to cooperate with Motta, the reactionary head of the government, that they do not even stop at splitting the Social-Democratic Party.

No, a mere occasional burst of indignation is not enough. The enemies of working class unity, the carriers of bourgeois tendencies within the working class movement, have too strong a backing in their own bourgeoisie to be affected by mere words.

They are even prepared to countenance the sort of "radicalism" which is at present represented by the "Revolutionary Socialists" in Austria in common with certain German Left-wing Social-Democrats. With the motto "We want to contribute to the intellectual clarification and reorientation of German and international Socialism" these Socialists take up an attitude which cannot constitute a serious menace to the confirmed capitulators, but which will cause a lot of harm in the ranks of those Social-Democratic workers who are searching for a real renovation of the movement and are groping for support. From the reverses suffered by the working class movement and anti-fascism these Socialists draw conclusions which must not be left uncontradicted.

They deny the possibility of creating a broad united democratic fighting front against fascism, and persuade the proletariat that it should become self-sufficient. This conception has for its practical consequence a resignation to fascist expansion which in the case of the "Revolutionary Socialists" is decorated with "revolutionary" frills by the discovery of "progressive tendencies" in fascism. By force of "laws" inherent in fascism they expect fascism to evolve into socialism and direct the thoughts of the workers towards a "total" "European" revolution. In this they are not deterred by the fact that the spread of fascism worsens the conditions of the

struggle for the working class. They who in their own country, despite favorable circumstances, were unable to check fascism are now placing all their hopes in the "total" domination of fascism as a result of which they predict a "total" turnover to socialism, "total" throughout Europe.

For the working classes of the countries menaced by fascism such a doctrine is fatal, for it discourages the working class and to an even greater extent than formerly in Germany inspires it with the disastrous illusion that fascism is a necessary transitional stage towards socialism. That such a conception, on top of everything else, isolates the working class from all possible allies requires no special explanation.

No less fatal are these theories for the anti-fascist movement in the countries under fascist rule. Here too, they split the forces instead of uniting them. Here again they raise a barrier between the active members of the working class and the large sections of the population who are in opposition to the regime. Finally they render more difficult the development by the Marxist workers of class-consciousness among the National-Socialist workers and the workers under fascist influence, for this "total" conception leaves no room for the systematic development of the revolutionary day-to-day struggle in the shops, in the localities, on the countryside, etc. Nor does it afford an opportunity to link up with the tendencies of opposition, now spontaneously beginning, the movement of autonomy, for national independence, for freedom of conscience, for clean administration, etc., etc., and to support and help on such movements.

The roots of these pseudo-revolutionary theories are to be found in a decided lack of confidence in the strength of the working class. Their advocates see only the negative aspects of the working class movement, thrown into relief by the policy of Social-Democracy. In reality they are afraid of a consistent development of the anti-fascist struggle and in this they are curiously in agreement with the capitulators, the representatives of the ideological and practical cooperation with the bourgeoisie.

What is it they fear? They prefer not to speak of this openly, but their articles and the speech of the "Revolutionary Socialist" representative at the meeting of the L.S.I. executive gives them away: What they fear is the Communist International and the U.S.S.R.

Gustav Richter, one of the leaders of the "Revolutionary Socialists," proposes —very consistently—that the Communist International should be dissolved, *i.e.*, the only organization which unhesitatingly and untiringly carries on the struggle against fascism.

The Communist International and the Communist Parties affiliated to it take their tasks in the struggle against fascism much too seriously to dally with such shameful and suicidal suggestions even for a single instant. For their part they ask no one to dissolve themselves or to disarm but regard it on the contrary as their task everywhere to do constructive work in building up and extending the united front against fascism.

Sincere Social-Democratic workers must surely be struck by the fact that in the leading circles of Social-Democracy Right-Wing and pseudo-revolutionary "Left-wing" leaders raise their voices in unison against the Soviet Union. What is it they want? Is there any connection here with the anti-Bolshevik, anti-Soviet bloc the ideological leadership of which is in the hands of the German fascists? There are quite a number of personal links through the Menshevik emigres and the Trotskyite agents of fascism. In the present serious situation, in which the fascists and imperialist reactionaries are making extensive preparations for a war against the Soviets, Social-Democrats who are faithful to their class can no longer tolerate such ambiguities. The Soviet Union is the strongest and most reliable asset of the international working class. Whoever incites against the Soviet Union or who allows his attitude to the Soviet Union to appear in an uncertain light, cannot be a reliable fighter for the working class, nor an uncompromising enemy of fascism.

RALLY AROUND THE FIGHTING UNITED FRONT IN SPAIN

The great task before us today, the fulfilment of which is a vital necessity for the working class of all countries, is to render every kind of effective assistance to republican Spain.

This means a determined struggle against reaction and against fascist forces in the countries participating in the blockade or in the intervention in Spain.

This means further a determined struggle against all elements within the working class who support the blockade of republican Spain.

The resistance offered by Citrine and his ilk within the L.S.I. and the International Federation of Trade Unions to the breaking of the blockade and to effective assistance for republican Spain must be broken in the interests of the future of the whole international working class.

If the workers of each country give their support to the working class and the fighting people of Spain, if the Socialists and trade unionists see to it that their organizations take seriously, discuss and fulfil the demands and suggestions of the Spanish working class organizations, then the sound and sincere forces of the international working class who rally to the Spanish working class will finally gain the ascendant over the capitulators and will thus make the most valuable contribution to the advance of the international working class movement.

In Spain Communists, Socialists and Anarcho-Syndicalists have given a brilliant and vital example of the unsuspected forces which the working class can develop in itself and in the whole people if in joint action against fascsim it throws off the hindering fetters of Social-Democratism.

The words of R. Lamoneda, General Secretary of the Socialist Party of Spain, who said that the most important thing was the unity of Socialists and Communists in the struggle against fascism, are of all the greater significance for the international working class as this unity did not drop into the lap of the Spanish working class but was the fruit of a hard struggle, a struggle against the resistance of reactionary forces within Social-Democracy who attempt again and again to gain influence, and against the machinations of the Trotskyite agents of fascism. "Only the capitulators want a split between Socialists and Communists," said Lamoneda, and these words again are of international validity.

All workers who in these times seek a way out of the confusion created by the ideology and practice of cooperation with the bourgeoisie are being directed into the right channels by the attitude of the Spanish working class. The struggle of the Spanish people against fascist intervention is a source of power and rejuvenation for the working class movement. In Spain the working class has chosen to be the hammer instead of still being the anvil. In Spain and in the active struggle of the international working class for the breaking of the blockade decisive milestones are being passed on the way to the political unity of the international working class which is the desire of all workers faithful to their class.

Czechoslovakia—A Warning to All Nations

BY RUDOLF ARNOLD

AT THE Congress of the French Radical Socialist Party in Marseilles Daladier said in his speech on foreign policy among other things:

"I declare once more with all the strength I possess that for the entire civilization of Europe, for our ideal of liberty, for our country and for Czechoslovakia herself, the position created by the Munich agreement is preferable to the situation which would exist today had the war not been avoided."

This statement which turns all facts upside down was made at the end of October, at a time when the whole extent of the terrible catastrophe which the Munich agreement had brought on Czechoslovakia was already known and when the nations were already aware of the fact that it was not peace which had been saved at Munich but Hitler's ability to wage a large-scale war which had been greatly increased.

The immediate and first victim of the Munich betrayal, dismembered Czechoslovakia, bleeding from a thousand wounds, is by no means of the same opinion as M. Daladier. The Czechoslovak people who were prepared to fight for the integrity and independence of their country, for the preservation of their rights and liberties as citizens and for the cause of universal peace, to fight with arms in their hands and make the greatest sacrifices, the Sudeten German anti-fascists who are now being crushed under the Hitler jackboot, the liberty-loving Hungarian peasants who now have to bend again to the old yoke of the magnates, the Polish miners of the Karwin coalfields who do not want to work under the rule of the Warsaw invaders—they all curse the Munich agreement, they hate its authors and despise the "Socialists" who have approved it.

The Munich betrayal has torn Czechoslovakia limb from limb. Hitler Germany took a large chunk out of the country—28,291 square kilometers with 3,638,000 inhabitants. Poland swallowed the regions of Teschen, Jablonkau, Karwin and two other districts of Slovakia with a total of over 260,000 inhabitants. Horthy Hungary, after the Viennese arbitration award of the two fascist axis powers, seized great parts of Slovakia and Ruthenia, altogether a territory measuring 11,823 square kilometers and numbering 1,027,000 inhabitants. The population of the republic decreased by a full third, from fifteen millions to about ten millions.

The territories occupied are the most highly developed industrial regions and the most fertile areas, territories rich in natural resources, which formed the wealth of the republic. Czechoslovakia has lost most of her coalfields, the bulk of her glass and textile industry, the whole of her pottery industries, nearly all her paper mills, important chemical and metal works, the world-famed Bohemian health resorts, etc. Slovakia and Ruthenia have been deprived of their fertile grain and wine districts and both countries are now turned into grain-importing regions. Ruthenia has been dismembered so as to give Hungary

the fertile plains and important cities including the capital Uzhorod while Czechoslovakia was allowed to retain only the barren mountains of the Vrchovina.

The Munich agreement has robbed Czechoslovakia of her frontiers which for a thousand years had served to protect and defend the country. The mountains which surround Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia like a natural fortress are now in the hands of the fascist invaders, together with all the mighty fortifications built up in four years of labor on the model of the French Maginot line with an expenditure of nearly twenty billion Czech crowns.

Further, the line of demarcation was so drawn as to put the most important nerve centers of the republic within immediate reach of the enemy. Prague could today be bombarded by long-range guns from the frontier, the Skoda armament works in Pilsen could be thus machine-gunned, the second largest city of the republic, Brno, is only nine miles from the frontier. Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, is divided from the Third Reich only by the width of the Danube, and the great foundries of Witkowitz can be attacked with Mills bombs from the frontier, so near is it. The vital railway lines connecting the various provinces of Czechoslovakia with each other have been cut at several points by the German, Polish and Hungarian invaders and railway traffic is now possible only on secondary lines with great detours or, in some cases, has ceased altogether. Ruthenia is completely isolated from the rest of the republic so far as traffic is concerned. Neither a railway nor a major road now leads into this country. Thus Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier have deliberately thrown Czechoslovakia, bound hand and foot, to the German fascist wolves. A country without natural frontiers, without fortifications and without traffic arteries cannot put up a military defense any longer and is no longer a danger to Hitler fascism. France has sacrificed her strongest and most reliable ally in Central Europe.

But Czechoslovakia was dismembered not only without considering the economic, military and traffic requirements of the country but also without considering the national partition of the population. Article IV of the Munich pact says that after the occupation of the first four zones, the rest of the territory "of a preeminently German character," which is to be occupied as the fifth zone, would be fixed by the international commission. Article V says that this international committee, which was to consist of representatives of the four great powers and a representatives of Czechoslovakia, would determine the areas in which plebiscites were to be held. The representatives of Britain and France in the Berlin commission did not, however pay the slightest attention to the national partition and the wishes of the population but simply agreed to all the demands put forward by Hitler and had no other reply to the protests of the Czechoslovak representatives than the stereotyped command: "Accept! Accept! Accept!" Thus before October 10 a number of preeminently Czech and purely Czech areas were torn out of uniformly Czech language areas at the demand of Hitler. These areas were all of great military, economic and traffic importance, thus, for example, the district of Lundenburg with 93.6 per cent and the district of Hohenstadt with 76 per cent Czech inhabitants.

The decisions of the Berlin commission went beyond even what Hitler himself had demanded in Godesberg. But even this did not satisfy the territorial appetite of Hitler. At the final drawing of the frontier another lot of more than a hundred important and purely Czech localities were taken away and new bleeding wounds inflicted on Czechoslovakia—and this was done solely with a view to dismembering and gagging Czechoslovakia to such an extent that she should no longer be able to exist as an independent state.

The plebiscite provided for by the Munich agreement in certain areas has been dropped at the demand of the German fascists. Had such a plebiscite been held, the majority of the population in a great number of mixed-language areas (Brux, Dux, Teplitz, Reichenberg, etc.),

would have decided to remain within Czechoslovakia, for it cannot be supposed that even all adherents of the Henlein party were in favor of a union with the Third Reich, quite apart from the Czech population and the German anti-fascists in these areas. Thus Hitler fascism, though using the slogan "right of self-determination" to deceive the nations, has in actual fact prevented all plebiscites and has violated 2,811,000 Germans and 726,000 Czechs without consulting the people affected.

The Polish and Hungarian invaders followed the German example. Poland has seized a territory in which only 80,000 Poles live alongside of 180,000 Czechs. But the territory is rich in coal-fields and metal works and that is why it was stolen, without a plebiscite and against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population living there. The "arbitration award" of Vienna, made by the German and Italian defenders of the "right of self-determination of the nations," gave Hungary, not, it is true, the desired common frontier with Poland, but a number of important cities in Slovakia and Ruthenia, such as Kosice, Uzhorod, Munkacevo, etc., where the Hungarian population forms only a small minority. Up to the present the number of Hungarians living in Slovakia and Ruthenia totalled 681,360 souls, many of them scattered among the Slovak population. But after the fascist interpretation of the "right of self-determination of the nations" Hungary occupied an area inhabited by 1,026,903 people, among them 288,611 Slovaks and Czechs; 35,250 Ruthenians; 13,481 Germans and 51,578 Jews.

After the Munich conference Leon Blum heaved a sigh of relief and said: "One can sleep again. One can enjoy the warming rays of the autumn sun again." But in Czechoslovakia there are innumerable people who cannot share the relief felt by Leon Blum, who can neither sleep after September 29 nor enjoy the beauties of the autumn sunshine. These people are the German, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Ruthenian and Jewish refugees who had to leave their all and fly from the invaders in order to save their very lives. The "attractive" prospect of death, the concentration camp and the Jewish pogroms compelled them to flee.

The number of the unfortunates is estimated at from 250,000 to 300,000, most of them from the Sudeten German areas. They are joined by new refugees day after day because the German, Hungarian and Polish "conquerors" have established a reign of terror surpassing in cruelty anything experienced from them in the past. The small spot left of what was once Czechoslovakia is crowded with 300,000 emigres who have lost their homes and their livelihoods and who look to the future in hunger and desperation. Truly terrible is the situation of the Sudeten German anti-fascists for they are threatened, in addition to all the misery of the refugee, with extradition into the hands of Hitler. For these courageous fighters the "angels of peace" Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier have not even the modest gift of the right of asylum.

The casualty list of Czechoslovakia is enormous. The blame for this catastrophe falls, in the first place, on the policy of the ruling clique in Britain and France, *i.e.*, the policy of retreat before fascism. This policy, which is a crime against the nations and the small states and which will finally come home to roost in Britain and France themselves, is responsible for catastrophe after catastrophe. After the rape of Manchukuo came the rape of Ethiopia, after the war of intervention in Spain came the Japanese robber war in China, after the invasion of Austria the catastrophe of Czechoslovakia. And now it is the turn of other small nations and states. And there is no doubt that they will have to take their turn if the policy of yielding to the brutal aggression of fascism is continued and unless the catastrophe of Czechoslovakia will rouse the international working class and the people of all countries and unite them in a common front to oppose fascist barbarism and the incendiaries of an imperialist war.

German fascism having chopped off the four limbs of Czechoslovakia is now preparing to turn its defenseless victim into a pliable instrument of its designs.

On November 7, Ribbentrop declared to representatives of the press:

"If after the final demarcation of the frontier the Czechoslovak government is prepared to take into account the new situation to the fullest extent and to make a complete change in its policy towards Germany, then a compromise with this state and a final peaceful relation between the two nations will be possible."

The "saviors of peace" have after Munich and September 30 left the Czechoslovak republic to her fate or rather to Hitler "for further treatment." The fascist "victor," who got the better of his opponent not through his own strength or by force of arms but only through the treachery of the imperialist cliques of Britain and France, knows no mercy. He demands that Czechoslovakia should take into full account the "new situation." What Hitler fascism means by this can be observed day after day in watching the development of Czechoslovak home and foreign policy.

The independent foreign policy of this country was a thorn in the flesh of Hitler for a long time. This thorn is now being removed, the foreign policy pursued by Czechoslovakia up to now is being rapidly cancelled and at the orders of Berlin the country must adapt itself to the fascist axis. In almost every one of his speeches Hitler declares that he has no intention of interfering with the internal affairs of other states. The example of Czechoslovakia shows that wherever an opportunity offers, he interferes in the worst possible manner with the domestic affairs of other states. In all spheres of home policy the Czechoslovak people now feels the weight of Hitler's hand.

On the pretext that he will not tolerate "Bolshevism" on the frontiers of the Third Reich he is out to destroy democracy in Czechoslovakia and to exterminate the traditions of freedom which animate the people of Czechoslovakia. He knows that the present mutilated republic will be preserved as an independent state only if democracy and with it the creative forces of the people are preserved on its soil. If democracy is killed, if the people is gagged then Czechoslovakia as an independent state will disappear from the map. The open interference of Berlin with Czechoslovak internal policy is a disgrace deeply felt by the Czech people. The first victim of this interference was President Benes, who was forced to resign.

In the future Berlin wishes to prescribe to Czechoslovakia the President and government she is to have. The Syrovy government is not sufficiently reactionary in its composition.

The German fascists therefore demand the resignation of this government and the establishment of a completely reactionary authoritarian government which will suspend parliament, cancel all constitutional rights of the people and dance to the tune called by Berlin. The Slovak government is already a mere agency of Berlin, is being constantly used against Prague and is exercising pressure on Prague to evolve in the direction of fascism. Hitler it is who decides today which political parties may exist in Czechoslovakia and which must be banned or dissolve themselves. He has not only enforced the cessation of the activities of the Communist Party and of several revolutionary mass organizations and the confiscation of the entire Communist and revolutionary press, he has also obtained the transformation of the whole party life of this state in accordance with the wishes of the reactionaries.

The German Social-Democratic Party has dissolved itself "of its own volition," the Czech Social-Democratic Party has left the Labor and Socialist International and transformed itself into a "National Party of the Working Population." The Czech Socialist Party and the Catholic Czech Popular Party have split and the Right wings of these parties have joined the "Party of National Unity" formed by the former Right-wing parties.

In Slovakia the reactionary Hlinka Party lays claim to complete "totality" while in Ruthenia the activities of all parties have been banned by the authorities. In this situation it is not surprising that at present there is a German National-Socialist group in the parliament

of Prague, which consists of former Social-Democratic M.P.'s who have remained in Prague with the object of disrupting and undermining the republic, that in Slovakia the adherents of the former Henlein party have formed a new "German Party" which has given the Secretary of State to the Slovak government and that the swastika flag can now wave freely in Czechoslovakia and *Mein Kampf* be sold without restriction.

It is not yet certain what is to become of the formerly so strong and well-organized Czech army. One thing, however, is certain already: that Berlin will demand a considerable reduction of its strength, a step which will deprive it of all significance.

The fangs of the fascist serpent are digging deep into the economic vitals of Czechoslovakia. Goering wants to fit Czechoslovak economy, and especially the still very considerable armament industry, into his own four-year plan. No new industries are to be set up and, according to the plans of the Third Reich, Czechoslovakia is to be turned into an agricultural country supplying Germany with foodstuffs in exchange for industrial goods. Czechoslovak economic life is in the future to be directed from Berlin.

As for communications, Czechoslovakia is to be drawn into the German traffic system, as if it were already part of the Third Reich. Berlin has blackmailed Prague into accepting the construction of an extra-territorial motor-road running from Breslau to Vienna through Czechoslovak territory. The road is to be the property of the Third Reich, is to be fenced in on both sides and be a closed unit from the customs point of view. Traffic police and general supervision are to be in Reich German hands. Thus, German fascism will have its own police inside Czechoslovakia. Furthermore, Hitler Germany has been given a privileged railway connection, so that trains can run from Breslau to Vienna through Czechoslovakia without passport and customs examination.

Cultural life in Czechoslovakia, which had reached a very high level, is now to be assimilated to the German model. A beginning has already been made by banning Soviet Russian and other progressive films and by the closing down of the well-known "Liberated Theater" in Prague. The very own product of German fascism, the barbarism of Jew-baiting, is to be imported into Czechoslovakia, as shown by the Jewish pogroms in Slovakia.

All these facts show that the fascist rulers in Berlin now regard the victim of Munich as a colony with which they can do as they please. The Munich agreement—described by Daladier as the best solution even for Czechoslovakia—has not only torn up, violated and rendered impotent that country but has also reduced it to a sort of colony of the Third Reich.

In this connection one must not fail to mention the part played by the Czechoslovak reactionaries in the development of the Czechoslovak home and foreign policy after September 30. These reactionaries have proved themselves to be docile tools of Hitler, prepared to accept and carry out all his demands. Without the assistance of this internal reaction Hitler could not rule Czechoslovakia, just as the reactionaries by themselves would be unable to hold down the Czechoslovak people without the cudgel of Hitler in their hands. Internal reaction in Czechoslovakia and German fascism have ever been, and still are, allies, just as the reactionary imperialist cliques in other countries are allies of the fascist robbers. If the Czechoslovak people had only its own reactionaries to deal with, it would still be strong enough, even after its recent defeat, to settle accounts with them. But today German fascism gives the Czechoslovak reactionaries the strength and the power to exploit the catastrophe of their country for their own sinister ends directed against the Czechoslovak people.

* * *

When Chamberlain returned to London from Munich he said that he had "saved peace for our generation." In his great article written on the occasion of November 7 of this year, Comrade Georgi

Dimitroff exposed this deception and warned us:

"It would be a most *dangerous delusion* at the present time for the laboring masses and the peoples to believe the false pro-fascist legend that it is peace that has been secured at the price of the predatory dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, that German fascism has by this act of violence completed the fulfillment of its program of aggression in Europe and that the peoples may sleep in tranquility." *

The policy of capitulation which triumphed in Munich did not save peace but it did bring us nearer war because the sacrificing of Czechoslovakia gave the fascist robbers political, military, strategic and economic positions of great importance which they will use in the subsequent pursuit of their plans directed towards the redistribution of Europe and the imperialist enslavement of a number of small nations.

And yet peace could have been saved and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia avoided if the British and French governments had not, for the sake of their imperialist class interests, betrayed Czechoslovakia and by so doing saved the fascist regime in Germany. The majority of the German people hate war and hate its tormentors, the Nazis. It has been watching for an opportunity of freeing itself from the detested fascist yoke. Anti-fascist feeling and the desire to fight actively against the fascist regime were broader and deeper in the Third Reich during the Czechoslovak crisis than was generally supposed. Many facts which did not become known until later point to this. Had the reactionaries who are now in office in Britain and in France been prepared to fulfill their obligations towards Czechoslovakia in all circumstances, just as the Soviet Union was prepared to do, then German fascism would have had to bury its plans of conquest and climb down—or it would have been beaten and that with the assistance of the German people itself. But what Chamberlain and Daladier wanted was precisely to prevent the collapse of Hitler fascism.

There is only one way to save peace: to pursue a policy of resolute struggle against the fascist aggressors. A policy which must be determined, and prepared to use even force, armed force to inflict a decisive defeat on the aggressor by collective effort, and thus to save an attacked country and peace. Hypocritical pacifist sermons about peace at all costs serve only to encourage the fascist robbers. The sad example of Czechoslovakia is sufficient proof of this and its fate should serve as an urgent warning to all nations and all friends of peace.

The fascist aggressors make no secret of their further plans of robbery. It is all cut and dried that various other small nations and states are to share the fate of Czechoslovakia—Jugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, etc. It is therefore necessary that the inhabitants of these countries draw a further conclusion from the catastrophe of Czechoslovakia. This conclusion is that in no circumstances should they permit their own country to capitulate in the face of aggression, even if the conspiracy of Munich is followed by other acts of betrayal, but that they must courageously, even though at first alone, take up the struggle against the rapacious aggressor.

The Czechoslovak government was subjected to the strongest pressure by the British and French governments. The heads of the Czechoslovak government surrendered on September 30 and accepted the Munich dictate. True, it did so under the pressure of the four great powers but also owing to its own lack of determination and its fear of responsibility, and influenced by a long-prepared conspiracy of the Czech reactionaries. But this retreat at the last minute was fatal.

The people of Czechoslovakia were full of courage and enthusiasm and wanted to fight. The army, after a successful mobilization, was in excellent moral and political condition; its million and a half

---

* Georgi Dimitroff, *After Munich*, p. 11, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

men were technically well-trained and equipped and could base their defense of the republic on an excellent even though not yet quite complete system of forts and fortifications. The comparatively large armament industry of the country was able to keep the army well supplied and there was no lack of food. In addition to this the Soviet Union was prepared to fulfil all her obligations.

In these circumstances Czechoslovakia would have well been able to defend herself for a time with her own forces alone. It is a fairy tale that she would have been simply overrun in no time. The nation in arms would have accomplished miracles of valor and upset the calculations of the military experts who always see forces and counter-forces in the abstract only. We are still firmly convinced that if Czechoslovakia had acted thus she would not have remained alone to fight her war of defense. Anti-fascists from all countries would have hurried to the assistance of the attacked country as they had hurried to help Spain; from Jugoslavia alone several thousand volunteers had offered their services even before the Czechoslovak army was mobilized. The people of France and Britain would certainly not have remained placid spectators and left Czechoslovakia to fight alone. In these countries a mighty popular movement would have arisen to defend the small country attacked by the fascists and to defend peace, freedom and human rights. The Daladier and Chamberlain governments would have been swept away. The mass of the people of these countries would have understood that this was not a question of rendering a service to Czechoslovakia, but that in defending Czechoslovakia they were defending their own interests and the interests of their countries from the bloodthirsty Hitler fascists. Such a change in Britain and France would certainly not have been delayed long and a number of other countries which in the critical days of September were seeking for a firm support and orientation would have been swept along and would have rallied to the united front directed against war-thirsty fascism.

Had Czechoslovakia not capitulated, Hungary and Poland would have thought twice before they made common cause with Hitler fascism. Now the Czechoslovak people are feeling that "peace at all cost" as preached by the hypocritical spokesmen of French "democracy" and certain leaders of the Labor and Socialist International is much worse than a just war in defense of the interests of all mankind from the barbarous onslaught of fascism.

The Czechoslovak people is now experiencing the greatest defeat in its history. All nations must learn their lesson from this sad experience and see to it that Czechoslovakia be the last country whose freedom and independence were destroyed by fascism.

The Revolution in Austria in 1918

BY F. FURNBERG

TWENTY years ago the revolution overthrew the centuries-old Austro-Hungarian monarchy, evicted the kaiser and the aristocracy, rocked bourgeois authority to its foundations and began work on its own program toward a real and genuine democracy of the people.

The peoples of that dual monarchy of idlers were roused into action. They gave voice to their national claims, while simultaneously the oppressed classes, the workers and in many districts even the peasants, demanded the realization of their social claims. The revolutionary movement gripped the masses. For the time being the ruling classes were, so to speak, scoured away. The Socialist working class was able to grasp with its hands the object of its struggles.

Today, twenty years later, fascism reigns over almost the whole territory of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The workers and peasants, in fact the entire nation, are paying in blood and in kind for the mistakes and treachery of their leaders. However, the experiences gleaned from this period of struggle, especially those of the 1918 revolutionary period, bear the greatest significance in the struggle against fascism toward the freedom of the people.

The Hapsburg monarchy was a racial mixture occupied by the Austrian bourgeoisie and the Hungarian feudal aristocracy, with the kaiser as its mutual chief. In these states national and social contrasts were closely intertwined. The Hungarian lord of the manor was both the national and social oppressor of the Slovakian and the Croatian peasant. The Czech worker often waged his class struggle against the capitalists as a national struggle for, in most cases, capital confronted him in the form of the Austrian ruling classes.

This intertwining of national and social contrasts brought about the particular weakness of the imperial regime. The revolutionary forces embraced not only the class conscious workers of the ruling nations Austria and Hungary, but also the oppressed peoples as a whole: the Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Ruthenians, Italians and Ukrainians. The props of the imperial regime were the Hungarian feudal aristocracy, the Austrian bourgeoisie, the Austrian aristocracy, and for the time being the Polish aristocracy, a small section of the Czech bourgeoisie and the clergy. The state machinery of the monarchy was foreign to the people and corrupt even before the war.

The overwhelming majority of the 56,000,000 people living in the former state of Austria-Hungary was therefore hostile to the regime and the rulers.

The four-year murderous World War not only exhausted the economic and military forces of the dual monarchy but broke up completely the political cohesion and the moral forces of its ruling system. The hostility of the people became more and more stormy. Revolutionary watchwords appeared more and more frequently, sometimes as national and sometimes as social demands. The decomposition of state machinery and army assumed greater and greater proportions, especially in the last year of the war.

The great Russian Revolution produced the most immediate and penetrat-

ing effects on Austria. It instilled into the masses the revolutionary spirit. The break-up of the ally, Bulgaria, dragged in its train the demolition of the Austro-Hungarian monarchical front. The revolution, which had already announced itself by strikes and rioting, now became a reality and the Hapsburg monarchy fell to pieces. Within a few days nothing remained of the old regime, and new forces made themselves ready to assume power in the various parts of the state. Under this pressure from within and without, the old decayed structure of the Hapsburgs was completely demolished.

In summing up the reasons why the Austro-Hungarian revolution of 1918 triumphed, six essential points must be remembered:

1. The four-year war had exhausted the country, had been an enormous drain on the population, had brought hunger, poverty and misery in unprecedented measure to the people and had ended in military collapse.

2. The October Revolution in Russia had shown the way out of war, hunger and oppression by overthrowing the ruling imperialists of their own country. The soldiers and prisoners of war on the Eastern front became countless thousands of agitators for the violent uprising, the revolution. The watchwords of the Russian Revolution were caught up by the masses. That same organization of the Russian Revolution was applied in Austria as well. Councils of workers, soldiers and peasants sprang up.

3. The oppressed nations saw the possibility of winning national independence and self-government. They strove towards the destruction of the Central Powers in order to win their national freedom and in so doing they linked up definite social demands with their national aims.

4. Throughout the war the proletariat of each nation and the majority of peasants had not only become convinced of the necessity of the revolution, but they had the weapons in their hands. Henceforth they turned these weapons on the rulers and swept them off the picture at one blow.

5. The ruling classes, the Hungarian aristocracy and the Austrian bourgeoisie, were completely disorganized and, what was more, the Austrian bourgeoisie could no longer see any method at all of maintaining their old rulers. They despaired completely and left the field in panic.

6. The state machinery of the monarchy was not merely disarranged. It had simply fallen to pieces and in many places no longer existed at all.

Those are the chief reasons why the revolution triumphed in Austria-Hungary. From them, however, it follows that the peoples ruled by the monarchy had every possibility before them of establishing a real people's government.

The revolution that triumphed in Austria-Hungary in 1918 was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. It succeeded, however, the socialist revolution in Russia and it took place in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. From the beginning it bore the marks of the proletarian revolution and the question of the growing over of the bourgeois revolution into the proletarian revolution immediately arose. The revolution was directed against national oppression, against the monarchy, against the aristocracy and landed gentry, and in addition, against the imperial Austrian bourgeoisie and against capital.

The day after the national fetters had been torn off, and the aristocracy overthrown, the masses of the working people declared their desire to go forward to socialism. They made themselves ready to assume full control through the workers' and soldiers' councils. This, however, is where the tremendous and historic treachery of Social-Democracy become most notorious. This party, which for decades had spoken about the victorious struggle for socialism, now ranged all its forces against socialism, and, what was more, declared the newly begun revolution to be at an end. They stepped forth as the protectors of the bourgeoisie, in whose service they erected the new state.

The revolutionary masses of workers, the armed people fought against this be-

trayal. However, they did not have the Bolshevik revolutionary Party which, as organizer and leader, is indispensable to the struggle. The Communist Party, which had only just been founded, was ideologically and organizationally too weak to take over the leadership. The proletarian revolution was nipped in the bud, but even the bourgeois-democratic revolution was not carried out to its logical end.

Lenin characterized the situation as it then stood in Austria as follows:

"The proletariat of Western Europe has risen and in Austria-Hungary it has not left one stone standing upon another. The government there shows the same helplessness, the same absolute stupidity, the same wild confusion as that shown at the end of February by the government of Nikolai Romanov."*

In November, 1918, in the new Austria that had arisen from the ruins of the monarchy, there was no longer a government or force capable of withholding victory from socialism. Even Otto Bauer had to admit eventually:

"The railwaymen and workers employed in producing the necessities of life, could by great mass strikes have forced upon the state anything they wanted to. . . ."

"In the barracks the real power was in the hands, not of the officers, but of the soldiers." **

"Even the peasant had returned from the trenches full of hatred against war and militarism, against bureaucracy and plutocracy. Even he hailed the new freedom, the republic, and the overthrow of militarism. The peasant's belief was not different from that of the industrial worker, namely, that the political revolution must bring for the masses a revolution in property relations." ***

Never before had the Austrian people been so united and resolute about a complete social change. Never before did the people have so favorable an opportunity to take all power into its hands. But the Social-Democratic leaders, filled with disbelief and the deepest distrust in the forces of the working class, and taking alarm at the mass movement, strove with all their might to help the bourgeoisie back to power. They effected a coalition with the bourgeoisie and collaborated with them, declaring that their aim was to "maintain this coalition as long as possible, because it is the only guarantee that will preserve us from anarchy." (Renner at the state council on November 11, 1918.) In fact, the coalition government was maintained only until it was no longer a necessity to the bourgeoisie, until the latter could step into power again.

The Social-Democratic leaders were only able to carry out this treachery because the masses took them at their word, when they declared themselves to be fighters for "complete democracy" and for "socialism."

"Socialism in this state will then be worth fighting for, above all because it contains no privileges, and also because the proletariat sees in it the foundation of its political existence, complete democracy," declared Otto Bauer on October 31, 1918.

However, Social-Democratic leadership did not fight for "complete democracy." It did not even fight for the consistent, revolutionary achievement of bourgeois democracy. In opposition to the people and in constant conflict with them it recorded, however, the successes that the working class had gained in spite of everything. It abolished and destroyed the workers' and soldiers' councils.

The first decisive blow that Social-Democracy struck at the revolution and at the consistent realization even of bourgeois democracy was to obstruct the union between industrial workers and peasants, although then more than ever before, every possibility for this union existed. They continued with their pernicious policy of alleged "antagonism of

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 260, Russian Edition.

** Otto Bauer, *The Austrian Revolution*, p. 183, Vienna, 1923.

*** *Ibid*, p. 122.

interests between industrial workers and peasants" at a moment when the peasants were expectantly awaiting an upheaval in property relations on the land as a result of the revolution and of the industrial workers' support.

This change in the country districts would not yet have been by any means the proletarian revolution. It would only have finished the bourgeois revolution. Instead of uniting the peasants with the industrial workers, Social-Democracy pushed the peasants into the camp of the Christian Socialists. At a time when everything was in a state of flux, Social-Democratic leadership helped this reactionary party to re-establish in this manner its position in the country districts "in order to preserve the country from anarchy." Can any doubt exist that herein lies the basic reason why at a later time reaction and fascism were able to draw its reserves from the masses of the peasantry? Through the policy of Social-Democratic leadership, the working class had missed a historic and brilliant opportunity of establishing a firm union with the peasantry, at least of supporting the creation of a progressive peasant party and, by so doing, of providing a firm basis for democratic development.

Social-Democratic leadership also obstructed the final breaking up and destruction of reaction in the towns. The reactionary forces had crawled away, but from the very first day they began to assemble their forces, so that they could advance once again. It was not difficult to see that these nests had to be smoked out and removed if the people wanted to win and preserve its democracy. But the warnings of the Communists were thrown to the winds. The Social-Democratic leaders made fun of "the white mice" seen by the Communists. Thus the monarchist officers, the anti-working class bureaucrats and the reactionary strata of the middle classes were able to organize afresh. The Heimwehr in fact had already risen in this period.

Can there be any doubt whatever that herein lies the real reason why reaction and fascism later succeeded in finding their reserves among the lower middle class of the towns? The revolutionary settlement of accounts with the reactionary criminals and bloodsuckers, which the entire people demanded, was necessary in order to create a firm basis for democratic government by the people. Fearing the strength of the people's forces, Social-Democratic leadership obstructed this settlement of accounts.

A consistent carrying out even of the bourgeois revolution required that the state machinery should be completely purged of all reactionary elements. Instead, the democratic leaders advised the officials of reaction to make themselves scarce for a time. While workers, peasants and members of the lower middle class demanded that the old reactionary bureaucrats be thrown out and brought to judgment, Social-Democratic leadership was proud to work with the officials of the old order. They fraudulently called such procedure "democratic," although it was clear that a genuine fight for democracy would have demanded the renovation of state machinery inside and out.

Can there be any doubt whatever that herein lies the fundamental reason why reaction, and fascism later, found in the "republican state machinery" such willing support for the fight against the people and democracy? A genuine fight for democracy would have necessitated putting the state machinery completely into the hands of convinced and unflinching democrats, who would occupy a leading position among the industrial workers and peasants; instead, Social-Democratic leadership handed the young republic over to the old reactionary officials.

A fight for democracy would have meant making sure that the people had weapons. That would have required the complete disarmament of all reactionary groups and leagues, and the arming of the people. The weapons in the hands of the people—that was the surest safeguard of democracy. Instead, the reactionary units were not disarmed, but the revolutionary workers' formations were disarmed, as, for example, the 41st battalion of the People's Corps.

The Social-Democratic leadership tried to justify itself by recalling that the imperialist entente demanded the disarmament of the people. But this argument only reveals its anti-revolutionary attitude. If Social-Democratic leadership had not prevented this question from being put in a revolutionary form, it would have been possible, in spite of the pressure of the imperialist entente, to allow the workers and not the reactionaries to have arms. Can there be any more doubt today that the coalition government, by gradually disarming the masses and simultaneously arming the reactionary groups, smoothed the path on which reaction and fascism were to develop later?

A consistent carrying through of even the bourgeois revolution would have demanded an independent, bold and democratic foreign policy. Not a cowardly retreat before the imperialist entente, but an alignment with the revolutionary forces in other countries, especially with the republic of Soviet Russia, would have been necessary. Instead, the Social-Democratic leadership, in an understanding with the Austrian bourgeoisie, "combined" with the reactionary forces of the great Entente powers and the states that followed them. Owing to its cowardly disbelief in the might and future of the revolutionary movement, it succumbed voluntarily to all the dictates of the imperialists, although it was evident that Austrian democracy thereby must become weaker and isolated and not consolidated.

As Social-Democratic leadership had no trust at all in the creative force of the people, in the active initiative of the working class, in the tough endurance of the Austrian masses and in the revolutionary energy of the people, it declared that Austria was not self-supporting, and wanted to surrender once more the independence of the Austrian people. It seized on the old slogan of the Pan-Germans, "Union with Germany" ("Anschluss") in order to bring the newly begun and independent development of the Austrian people to an end as soon as possible.

Of course it will not dare to put the question for the people to vote on, since, according to Otto Bauer, it was not by any means certain that a majority would be obtained for this German national solution, which contradicted the entire historical development of Austria. At that time Germany was too weak to make use of this protective help offered by the Socialist Party leadership. In view of the differences existing between Germany and the Entente powers, and weighed down entirely by the might of the Entente, Austria remained an independent state.

Social-Democratic leadership, however, did not cease to carry on their propaganda for the pernicious slogan of the "Anschluss" with Germany. Can there be any doubt that the Socialist Party leadership, by following this Pan-German policy, placed weapons in the hands of German imperialists that were later used by Hitler against the Austrian people, and that this policy of Socialist Party leadership facilitated Hitler's path into Austria? Instead of surveying the strength of its own people, the Socialist Party leadership went so far in its policy of capitulation that it carried on propaganda for the surrender of its own state's independence. Can there be any doubt that herein lies the reason why later reaction and fascism, through the direct interference of imperialist and fascist states, were able to set the people in chains?

Thus the roots of the development of the past twenty years, the roots of the temporary fascist triumph in Austria and the occupation of Austria by the brown detachments, lie in the treacherous policy of Social-Democratic leadership which opposed not only the further development of the revolution into its proletarian stage but also the consolidation of democracy. In the last twenty years the Austrian working class has had more than one opportunity of correcting the old mistakes.

The Communist Party of Austria, which was at that time very small, waged a fierce struggle to set the workers on the right path. But this was all ob-

structed by Social-Democratic leadership, which clung to its policy of pacts and capitulation and instilled in the people that they were powerless to effect any revolutionary resistance. The forces of reaction grew. The state machinery revealed its true face. The peasantry and major part of the lower middle class were able to be misled by reaction and fascism. In spite of the stand made by the working class and the Communist Party, the inner and outer forces of fascism compelled the entry of fascist rule.

The working class and the whole people have learned their lesson from the past. If in 1918 the union between workers and peasants was balked; if the peasants were incited against the workers for twenty years, today the realization is growing that the unity of the people is a necessity. This realization is becoming stronger and stronger even among the middle-class town dwellers. The common front for all Austrians is being forged in the fight for freedom and independence against the fascist foreign rule.

If the unity with the consistently progressive democratic forces of other lands was obstructed in 1918, the Austrian people understands today more than ever the necessity for the closest contact with these masses, which are fighting against fascism and the aggression of fascist states, and at whose head the Soviet people stands. The front of freedom-loving Austrians wants to and will fight in the same ranks as the Soviet Union, the democratic peoples of the West and the anti-fascist masses of Germany.

If in 1918 the state machinery was not renovated, and the weapons were torn from the people, the aim of the Austrians in their fight today is a democratic republic, in which the masses themselves provide for all assurances against reaction and fascism, in which they disarm the enemies of the people, keep the weapons in their own hands and entrust the state machinery only to those who have proved themselves the most faithful and trustworthy sons of the people.

The old Social-Democracy of Austria suffered complete ruin in its ideals and its organization. The Communist Party of Austria is holding high the revolutionary fighting traditions of the working class. It stands at the head of the struggle for freedom. It is forging the united front of the working class, and in doing this, it is prepared to join with all forces that are ready to fight fascist foreign rule, and to construct a free democratic republic of Austria. The Austrian people is combining its fight towards this goal with the daily struggle against fascist exploitation and oppression, against fascist war policy and war preparation.

In 1918 the Austrian people could not establish and consolidate its rule because it lacked the Bolshevik Party, the organizing powers of leadership, clarity of aim and experience.

Now it possesses an experienced and revolutionary party, the Communist Party, and its leader in the struggle for national and social freedom. Moreover, in this time of bitter struggle, the forces that will lead the people to victory are being tempered. The fascists in Austria are "gentlemen of passage." The immortal people learns from its history and from its defeats. It will speak its word and victoriously will take its destiny into its own hands.

The Peasants in the Year 1918-1919

BY OTTO FISCHER

IN NOVEMBER, 1917, the fourth winter of the World War was at hand. Once more German soldiers were to endure the hell of winter on the Western front. In the East, the Russian winter threatened with its snowstorms. In the Carpathians, in the mountains of the Balkans, among the glaciers of the Ortlers, and in the swamps of the Piave, German, Austrian, Hungarian, Croatian and Czech soldiers would have to "carry on until final victory." The fourth winter of the war threatened the front and the home bases of the Central Powers with an intensification of the suffering, privation and torment of this apparently interminable slaughter of the peoples.

The brutal, soulless machine of the military dictatorship ruled in the towns and on the countryside of Germany and Austria-Hungary. The militarized factories were working for "war purposes"; the peasants sowed and reaped for "war purposes." War economy squeezed the last remnant of well-being from town and country. Door-handles, kettles and other hardware were taken, together with bells from the church-towers, to the collecting depots, in order to be melted down. Poverty, sickness and starvation had attained unprecedented heights, while war profits were enormously swollen.

In this particular November, peace was born in St. Petersburg. The victorious Russian October Revolution had borne upon its banners the slogan of "immediate peace, without annexations or indemnities." It showed the peoples the way out from mass murder. Neither the fronts which ringed the home peoples like steel bands, nor the blockade of the Allies, nor the censorship, could prevent the tidings of the power for peace of the revolutionary workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils from penetrating to all cities and villages, into every trench. The indissoluble connection between all hopes for peace and the new Soviet power ensured victory for the idea of the councils.

THE PEASANTS' STRUGGLE AGAINST THE "MASTERS"

Not only the workers at the front, but also the peasants in uniform were prepared to accept the massage of peace from the young Soviet power. Over three years of experience in the trenches, shared with workers, necessarily made an impression upon the consciousness of the peasants who had been torn from their villages by the war.

Before the war, in the isolation of rural existence, they had been accustomed to look with suspicion upon everything which came from the cities. But in the trenches, the world assumed a new aspect: they were not divided into townsmen and countrymen, but into officers and soldiers. The class character of society was manifested in a grotesquely simplified form. The soldiers were workers, peasants and small middle-class people; the officers were the sons of nobles, the city and country bourgeoisie, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

Thus, the antagonism between city and country—nourished not a little by the narrow industrial-proletarian-craft outlook of Social-Democracy—vanished when faced with the antagonism between the class that commanded and the class which obeyed. There arose within the trenches a new sense of fellowship between workers and peasants. This experience of the solidarity between oppressed classes formed the soil upon which fell the seed of the Russian Revolution, and from it there grew the anger

of the peasant soldiery against the master class.

For the peasant, the term "masters" embodied everything that was hostile. The "masters" had started the war. They had taken the peasant and his son from their farm and flung them into the filth of the trenches. The "masters" had caused the cattle to be taken from their stalls, the grain and fodder from their barns. Here, the conception of "masters" is older than that of capitalism. For centuries these masters had been ruling the countryside and oppressing the peasants, they had their places in the civil service and the government, they dressed up in generals' uniforms and filled their bellies at the rear.

The centuries-old hatred of the peasant for the "masters" grew mightily in the trenches and was allied there to the resentment of the workers and of all other victims of war.

An end to this war without a reckoning, without revolution, must have appeared increasingly impossible. But how vague and varied were the hopes and expectations attached to this idea of revolution!

However, one idea surpassed and preceded all others, namely, that of peace. Nearly all were agreed that the first act of the revolution must be the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs. In the minds of those who were politically most mature there grew the certainty that the revolution could and would only be carried out by workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils. Nevertheless, on the question of the national self-determination of the peoples of the Hapsburg monarchy, for example, there was no sign of an agreed general plan.

In all social questions, the demands made on the revolution differed even more widely one from the other. The revolutionary workers were convinced that the coming revolution would overthrow the employers as well as the kaiser and the generals, that it would dispossess the capitalists and inaugurate socialism; although they had no very concrete conception of how this latter aim was to be achieved.

What did the peasants and agricultural workers expect of the revolution? In their minds, the conception of the end of the war was linked up with that of the end of wartime economy. For, quite correctly, they saw that the fighting and the economy were but two aspects of one and the same catastrophe.

Beyond this, the agricultural population considered it the task of a revolution to break the power of the "masters." The kaiser was far away, but the lord of the manor, the lord lieutenant, and all such feudal or semi-feudal rulers, were close by. If this power were broken, there would be a peasants' land instead of what, through force and injustice, was the masters' land. If this power were broken, the farm laborer could get a piece of land, the small tenant farmer could become a peasant proprietor. To become an independent farmer, working undisturbed—such was the desire of farm laborer, cottager and tenant farmer. Were this power broken, the peasant would be able to take timber from the manorial woods, to obtain pasture-land, rights of way.

A great volume of hopes and desires arose in the minds of these men; many of them mutually contradictory in some details, but all having a common preliminary condition: the power of the "masters" must be broken, the soil freed from the ownership of the large-scale landlords. "Socialization" was a meaningless term to practically all the rural population. They neither wanted it nor refused it. Thus it happened that all sections of the rural population—so long as they did not consider themselves to belong to the "masters," as did the peasant nobility—desired from the revolution, immediately following the establishment of peace and the abrogation of war economy, not the abolition of capitalism—which demand, in fact, they did not understand—but the downfall of the nobility and of all large-scale land ownership.

This common desire covered over, at least to some extent, the class contradictions within the rural population. Undoubtedly the objective possibility then existed of uniting the agricultural worker, the tenant farmer, the poor and middle peasant, and a considerable number of the larger peasants, under the leader-

ship of the working class, for bringing about an end to the war by revolutionary means and the abolition of feudal domination and methods of production. Naturally, any further development of the revolution would have caused the class antagonisms in the countryside to reawaken. But, in the late autumn of 1917, the further aims of the revolution were still completely shrouded in darkness. The arising revolutionary unity of the people visualized as the first and most definite objective, overshadowing all others, the ending of the war.

THE ALLIANCE OF WORKER AND PEASANT —AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Faced by this process of the spontaneous revolutionizing of the masses, the Social-Democratic Parties—in the view of these masses—were called upon to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary movement. However, this expectation of the masses by no means coincided with the attitude of the leaders of Social-Democracy. For they had, in the meantime, worked out for themselves a much simpler and more comfortable manner of proceeding towards socialism. Ballot in hand, striding from election to election, they foresaw eventually a parliamentary majority, and promised that, when they became the dominant party, they would introduce socialism by means of legislative enactment.

Although they had long ago abandoned scientific Marxism, they believed—or, at least, wished others to believe—that reformism was nothing other than the adaptation of Marxism to "altered circumstances." And, in particular, they felt called upon to rectify the "errors" of Marx and Engels with regard to the peasant question.

Marx and Engels had demonstrated the necessity of the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants, under the leadership of the working class, and in view of the approaching revolution had demanded that this alliance be realized; but as the reformists failed to see the necessity for the revolution, so did they also fail to recognize the need for such an alliance. Marx and Engels showed that the possibilities for such an alliance arose from the inevitable decline, from the frightful deterioration, of peasant economy under capitalism; but the reformists, on the other hand, insisted that peasant economy under capitalism was neither deteriorating nor being ruined.

Beneath this difference of opinion was concealed one of the grossest falsifications of Marxism ever attempted. When Marx and Engels spoke of the decline of peasant economy, they referred to the peasant family farm, in which wage labor was never, or only occasionally, employed. They drew a very sharp distinction between such farms and the definitely capitalist, labor-exploiting farms of the big peasant proprietors. But this distinction grew hazy and then altogether vanished with the reformists; and it was precisely these latest, modern farms, intensively worked on capitalist lines, and existing in a relatively small proportion, to which the reformists referred as typical of peasant economy. While Marx and Engels demanded an alliance with the vast mass of the peasantry which was becoming pauperized and ruined, the reformists had quite lost sight of this great section of the peasantry and could see nothing but the rich peasants and the large-scale employing farmers.

This divergence was already made clear in Hilferding's book, *Finance Capital*, in 1909. Hilferding wrote that the power of large-scale land ownership would grow through the disappearance or, at least, a considerable lessening of its antagonism to small ownership. With the removal of feudal burdens, the historical antagonism between large and small land ownership would vanish. The common struggle over tariffs, he maintained, had united large and small landed proprietors. The large estate-owner had become the leader of the small farmer.

And Kautsky's claim—that Social-Democracy would never be able to beat the agrarian parties—was to exactly the same effect as Hilferding's. But all this applied only to the small agrarian capitalists. For them, and for them alone, the antagonism to large-scale farming is of secondary importance, an antagonism within the limits of capital. For the

capitalist farmer only is the bourgeois revolution already consummated. But the vigorous vestiges of feudalism, existing in both Germany and Austria—such as feudal landlords' privileges and the semi-feudal dependent relationships of both peasants and land workers with the landed "gentry"—determined, and do still determine, to a great extent the consciousness of wide masses of the peasantry.

It is the conceptions which we have described above which were at the root of the policy of Social-Democracy with regard to the peasantry. On the one hand, the "peasant" must be induced to vote the Social-Democratic ticket. For this reason, the Social-Democratic Party showed a continuously increasing grasp of all measures leading to further rationalization of farming and increased productivity. Also, for this reason, they procrastinated in the organization of the agricultural worker and sought to restrain his demands within specific limits in order not to disgruntle the agrarian capitalists, who for them were the "peasants."

On the other hand, they taught the Social-Democratic workers to regard the peasants as covetous capitalists with no other desire than to raise prices and grow rich on the hunger of the workers. While the first aspect of the Social-Democratic agrarian policy—as described above—was practically unknown among the urban workers, this hostile attitude towards the peasantry became deeply rooted and nourished the conviction that the revolution could only be the achievement of the working class alone, in the struggle against all other classes in society. The teaching of Marxism, on the revolutionary alliance of the workers with the middle classes, and particularly with the peasants, which was further developed by Lenin and propagated by the Bolsheviks, had been completely forgotten in the West.

Such was the situation in which Social-Democracy was taken by surprise by the war, which was perforce to reveal its deep degeneration. Such in its essentials was the situation in the autumn of 1917, when Social-Democracy was taken by surprise by the Russian Revolution and by the approaching revolution in Austria and Germany. Social-Democracy could only see in the revolution an elemental catastrophe which disrupted the normal course of events.

THE RETURN FROM THE FRONT

In the autumn of 1918, the Central Powers were at the end of their strength. In September Bulgaria broke down, and in October Turkey, and later, Austria-Hungary and Germany, sued for an armistice. After a few last bloody convulsions, the war was over.

The peasant soldiers streamed back from the front to their villages. They were resolved to settle up with those who were to blame for the war and for all the ills from which peasants suffered. They brought back from the trenches the conviction that they would not have to fight this struggle alone, that the workers were solidly on their side, that it was above all the workers who would stand their ground in the fight with the master class. The last weeks in the trenches, the degrading and expulsion of officers and the formation of soldiers' councils had considerably strengthened the revolutionary spirit of the peasant soldiers, particularly in Austria.

But the spirit was very different in the villages towards which the soldiers were traveling. The continual requisitions, the ceaseless harassing by officials, all of which in some way or other proceeded from the city, to which should be added the growing and unconcealed hostility of the starving urban population to the peasants—all this led, over and above class antagonisms, to a definite solidarity of the villages as opposed to the cities, to a sharpening of the antagonism between town and countryside.

The returning peasant soldiers knew about this, from letters or from visits home on leave, but their faith in the solidarity of the oppressed classes, gained in the trenches, was at that time stronger than their rural suspicion of the town. They helped the workers chase out the officers; they sat with them in the soldiers' councils; they marched and rode homeward together with them.

How fierce must have been the dis-

appointment and anger of the returning peasants in Austria and in Germany, when they found the workers' councils requisitioning cattle and grain in their native villages. And even worse: the workers' councils proceeded in this to work together with the authorities, with the county officials—hand in hand with the hated apparatus of war restriction enforcement.

In his book on the Austrian revolution, Otto Bauer described this as if it had all arisen spontaneously. In actual fact, however, the workers' councils in Austria had been led by the Social-Democrats ever since January, 1918.

Born as organs of revolution, the workers' councils had fallen under the control of skillful Social-Democratic demagogues. There was no revolutionary leadership, no Bolshevik Party, to guide this spontaneous movement of the masses. It is true that the "Left Radicals," out of which the Communist Party was later to be formed, carried on an arduous struggle for the leadership of the workers' councils, but they were not yet a match for the skilled and experienced demagogues of Social-Democracy and the trade unions. It is true that the workers' councils were not always willing to accept instructions from the Social-Democratic Party, but the latter determined the direction of their activities. Social-Democracy stood protectingly before the state apparatus; only under its protection could the war restrictions continue, could the county officials continue to function. Social-Democracy had trained the workers in complete aversion to, and misunderstanding of, the peasants.

The terrible scarcity of food drove the workers' councils into efforts to obtain foodstuffs, and Social-Democracy allowed them a free hand as regards the peasants. The Social-Democrats saw how the revolutionary spirit in the villages was vanishing, to be replaced by hatred for the workers; they saw the political leadership, which the small peasants and rural workers had been able to grasp during the revolutionary uprising, going back into the hands of the rural bourgeoisie—and against all this they did nothing.

"The peasant saw that the revolution denied him the 'freedom that he loved.' He saw that, in the place of military requisitioning, it was now the workers' councils which enforced deliveries, which prosecuted illegal trading, and opposed the abrogation of maximum price fixing. The peasant duly saw that detachments of the people's guard were being quartered in his village—just as imperial troops had formerly been—until he had turned over the required grain, cattle or wood. The peasants saw in the proletariat the enemy who was denying him the free disposal of the products of his labor. And so—the peasant began to hate the proletariat, as formerly he had hated militarism." *

But it was Social-Democracy and not the workers' councils that compelled the prolongation of war-time restrictions. It was not the workers' councils that prevented the peasants from driving out the hated county officials but the leaders of Social-Democracy. And when both secular and ecclesiastical landowners denied thousands of small tenant farmers access to the soil, it was thanks to the leaders of Social-Democracy who stood on guard over woods and meadows which had been stolen from the masses throughout the centuries, and would not permit the peasants once more to take possession of that which originally had belonged to them.

And if detachments of the people's guards were sent to villages, in order to compel the peasants to deliver up their products, it was a people's guard which had been created and was led by Social-Democracy, and which carried out this act of force against the peasants by order of the government authorities and not of the workers' councils. The full responsibility for these crimes against the revolution may be laid at the door of the leaders of Social-Democracy and not of the workers' councils, which were only misused tools.

Naturally, the revolutionary spirit of the returning peasant soldiers could not survive these circumstances. The prevailing mood in the villages—previously neither revolutionary nor counter-revo-

* Otto Bauer: *Die Oesterreichische Revolution* (*The Austrian Revolution*), Vienna, 1923.

lutionary—now affected the returning veterans and was definitely directed against the working class.

When the peasants' councils entered together with the workers' councils into municipal, district or agricultural commissions, it was not to work, together with the workers' and soldiers' councils for the revolution, but in order to prevent the worst happening to the villages. In these commissions, they found support against the workers' councils forthcoming from their old enemies, the big landowners and the bureaucracy. Their revolutionary hopes vanished rapidly; they forsook the camp of revolution and flung themselves into the arms of counter-revolution.

THE PEASANTS' COUNCILS IN GERMANY

Developments in Germany were similar to those in Austria. Here also the Social-Democratic leaders soon succeeded in investing the councils with their own character, and transforming them into auxiliary organs of war-time economy. In the manifesto of the Social-Democratic government of Germany, of November 12, 1918, we may read as follows (as reported in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 15, 1918):

"The new German Reich government hereby calls upon all sections of the agrarian population, without distinction of party affiliation, to the combined, voluntary formation of peasants' councils, in order to safeguard the people's food, tranquility and order in the countryside, as well as the unhindered continuance of agricultural pursuits."

Thus the peasants' councils were entrusted with the task of preventing that which should have been the sole objective of peasants' councils—the achievement of the revolution in the villages. On November 19, there had already been constituted in Berlin a National Peasants' and Land Workers' Council, formed by representatives of all existing agricultural bodies—which is equivalent to saying that they represented the big landowners, the peasant nobility, and agrarian capital; for these forces controlled those bodies. The Social-Democratic trade union, the German Land Workers' Union, played a leading part in the formation of this national peasants' council. Its official report for 1914 to 1919 contains the following:

"At our instigation there took place on November 19, 1918, the first meeting of agricultural organizations, together with those of the workmen. On this day, the National Peasants' and Land Workers' Council was formed. This National Peasants' and Land Workers' Council's primary task was ensuring the safeguarding of the people's food and the continuance of agricultural production. . . . We intervened in order to ensure that these Peasants' and Land Workers' Councils should not become political organs. This paradox of history, that the conservative representation of the farmers should contribute to the protection of the revolutionary achievements, was estimated by us from the first as a transitory phenomenon. . . ."

While the land workers were awaiting their emancipation by the revolution and by the German Land Workers' Union, the latter was engaged in savoring the "paradox" of setting up a peasants' council in common with the counter-revolutionary Junkers.

Thus, in Germany the agricultural workers and the peasants were deprived of their revolutionary councils, right at the beginning of the revolution, and the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants was nipped in the bud.

The strength of the revolutionary spirit among the German rural population, and particularly among the agricultural workers, is shown by the tremendous growth in membership of the German Land Workers' Union. The total membership figures rose from 19,077 in 1913 to 695,695 in 1920, while in the same period the membership of the Christian agricultural workers' union rose from 5,576 to 69,520.

An unprecedented wave of agricultural workers' strikes swept over Germany. In 1919, there were 163 strikes, affecting 932 undertakings. In 1920, 366 strikes, affecting 3,220 concerns. During the Kapp putsch in March, 1920, sections of the Northeast German land workers—particularly those in Mecklenburg—rose against the counter-revolu-

tionary rebels. The workers locked up the landlords in the pigsties and attempted to form a Red Army. However, they remained isolated and without leadership. Von Lettow-Vorbeck, leader of the White-Guard bands, had some of them shot, after a "court martial." The Social-Democratic German republic tendered them no thanks for their heroic fight against counter-revolution.

While east of the Elbe, the revolutionary wave had mainly affected the agricultural laborers, in South and West Germany it also embraced the peasants. Unfortunately, reports are few regarding the efforts of the peasants to secure by revolutionary means satisfaction of their demands. In the manuscript of a work, not yet published, to which we have access, Edwin Hörnle writes as follows:

"The writer of this article remembers an episode he witnessed in the November days of 1918 in Würtemberg. In Würtemberg, about one-third of the parishes are 'feoffment-in-trust' parishes. In other words, a great proportion of the land within their boundaries is the entailed—that is, unsalable—property of some noble family. Only a small portion—sometimes none at all—of this feudal land is farmed capitalistically; the greater portion is leased to the peasants, by means of an auction, in small sections. In addition, the landowners possess a number of rights in the parish—rights of way, hunting and usufruct—without having to contribute towards the costs of maintenance. On the other hand, the parishes do not possess sufficient vested rights, either of woodcutting or of passage, in the extensive feudal forests. Such rights are vigorously contested by the landlords who institute much expensive litigation.

"A village of this type is Donzdorf, near Geislingen-on-the-Steige. On November 9, the peasants and semi-proletarians of this village marched, armed and determined, on the castle and forced the count to sign a document renouncing his feudal rights and ceding the leased farms. Great excitement prevailed in the provisional Social-Democratic government of the state of Würtemburg over this spontaneous action of the Donzdorf peasants. The Minister of the Interior, Crispien, then of the Independent Socialist Party, and the Premier, Wilhelm Blos, of the Social-Democratic Party, immediately cancelled the gains of the peasants, striving to appease them with promises of a 'legal settlement' of the land question at the forthcoming National Assembly, and issued a warning to all 'feoffment-in-trust parishes' in Würtemberg against imitating the example of Donzdorf." *

This one example should suffice to show how far the revolutionary ferment had progressed among the peasants, and how, from the earliest days, it encountered the opposition, not only of the big landlords and the old bureaucracy, but also of Social-Democratic governments. Under such circumstances, every movement of the agricultural workers and peasants must needs be nipped in the bud, arousing deep disappointment and resentment at this "revolution."

THE PEASANTS AND THE BAVARIAN SOVIET RULE

The situation in Bavaria was somewhat different from that in the rest of Germany.** Here Kurt Eisner had formed a Social-Democratic republic which on November 8 proclaimed a sort of Soviet republic, as follows:

"The Bavarian Soviet Republic is hereby proclaimed. The highest authority is the workers', soldiers' and peasants' council, elected by the population, which is provisionally nominated until a final people's representative body has been established. It possesses legislative powers."

At the same time, however, the temporary program of the provisional government stated that: "All former officials are to remain at their posts."

One day later, there appeared a decree of the Minister of the Interior, the Social-Democrat Auer, endowing the administrative bodies which had previously

---

* Edwin Hörnle: *Das Deutsche Dorf und die Grosse Sozialistische Oktoberrevolution* (*The German Village and the Great Socialist October Revolution*).

** The following statements are based mainly upon *Die Bayrischen Bauernräte* (*The Bavarian Peasants' Councils*), by Wilhelm Mattes, a social and historical investigation of peasant policy. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921.

been entrusted with food control with the right to continue their work, and with exclusive rights to issue decrees. This would, of course, immediately affect the peasants, as it implied the complete preservation of all war-time economic measures. Thus, the power of the councils—which had just been proclaimed—was virtually simultaneously suspended, so far as such suspension was within the power of the government. The governing functions remained in the hands of the old state apparatus.

The powerlessness of the councils in this "Soviet" (council) republic was again proved by the "provisional directives" issued on November 26, 1918. According to this, the workers', soldiers' and peasants' councils were indeed to compose the constitutional "foundation of the new system," but they would have no executive powers. In effect, they were granted only the right to require information from the authorities, the right to advise the authorities and the right to make complaints about the authorities. They were also obliged to aid in securing the rendering up of all superfluous foodstuffs and in the combatting of illicit trading.

Thus far, then, the circumstances of the peasants in Bavaria did not differ from those in the rest of Germany and in Austria. The peculiarity consisted in the establishment of a central peasants' council which, right from the beginning, was not an organ of counter-revolution, as was the national peasants' council, but was to a certain degree an organ of the revolutionary peasants.

The formation of this council was entrusted to the Independent Socialist, Ludwig Gandorfer, and, after his death in an automobile accident to his brother, Karl Gandorfer. Karl Gandorfer was the leader of the Left wing of the Bavarian Peasant League, the sole progressive, democratic peasant organization in Bavaria. The Central Peasants' Council, formed by him wholly of members of the Bavarian Peasant League—the elections never took place—stood by the councils right up until the violent overthrow of the Soviet power in Bavaria. The efforts of this Central Peasants' Council to persuade the Eisner government, and later the Soviet government, to adopt a policy which would receive the support of the peasants were unsuccessful. The leaders of the council themselves had only a confused conception of peasant policy; and moreover, they encountered on the side of the government a complete misunderstanding of the peasant question.

This was most clearly revealed in the "complete socialization" plans for agriculture which the more than questionable "Socialist," Dr. Neurath, had worked out. These plans embraced the nationalization of large estates and the compulsory organization of the peasants in productive cooperatives under a central authority. At the time of the Soviet power in Bavaria, Dr. Neurath was at the head of the Socialization Department. The Central Peasants' Council, immediately before the proclamation of the Soviet power, had declared itself prepared to support the dictatorship of the councils on condition that socialization of agriculture by Dr. Neurath's central department should take place only with the cooperation of the Central Peasants' Council and that it should only affect farms of over 330 hectares (a hectare is nearly two and a half acres). This condition—which was accepted—reveals the defensive position of the Central Peasants' Council as against "complete socialization."

Essentially, this is what happened: a considerable number of the rural population had hoped that the revolution would give the large landlords' estates to the peasants and agricultural workers. When the slogan of "complete socialization" first reached the villages, the peasants understood by it nothing but the division of the large estates among the peasants and laborers. Soon, however, they began to realize that "socialization" meant something quite different. It was true that the land was to be taken away from the big landlords; not to be divided up, however, but to be worked by some central administration. And, in addition to this, there was to be an infringement upon the peasants' economic freedom, for their labors were to be subordinated in some way to a central department.

Thus "socialization," for the peasants,

had been translated into its opposite. From the expectation of an increase in the peasants' holdings it had been converted into a menace to the land they already possessed. The better-off peasants—who suddenly began to fear that their land might be taken away, just as the big landlords' was to be—infected the smaller peasants with this apprehension. The Central Peasants' Council sought to remove this fear by securing the adoption of the highest possible minimum area for farms liable to "socialization." Yet it could do nothing to alter the fact that the peasants had lost all interest in the revolution, and that they continued to scent danger in "socialization."

The disappointment of the peasants' hopes for the abrogation of the war-time economic measures and for a division of the large estates followed upon their fear of "socialization," in which they could see nothing but an extension of war-time restrictive economy. Thus did the revolutionary elements on the countryside lose the leadership, which now fell into the hands of the counter-revolutionaries. The fate of the Bavarian Soviet regime was settled principally by the fact that even the extreme Left of German Social-Democracy was unable to liberate itself from the false attitude of Social-Democracy towards the peasant question.

THE PEASANT WON OVER BY COUNTER-REVOLUTION

The democratic revolutions of November, 1918, in Germany and Austria did not bring the peasants and agricultural workers a small fraction of that for which they had waited and hoped. The tasks of the bourgeois revolution remained unfulfilled, as before. The position of the agricultural workers east of the Elbe had changed but little. Large-scale ownership remained intact throughout all Germany and Austria.

It was an easy job for the bourgeoisie. A few trivial concessions to the rebellious peasants sufficed to alienate them for a long time to come from the influence of the revolutionary working class movement, and to bring them over into the train of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the working class. Thus, in Austria, it was the bourgeoisie who, in the spring of 1920, liquidated the war-time measures, against the opposition of the Social-Democrats.

Also in the question of land reform, it was the bourgeoisie who, against the opposition of Social-Democracy, showed a certain tendency to make concessions. As Otto Bauer wrote, in his book *Die Oesterreichische Revolution* (*The Austrian Revolution*):

"The provinces opposed to the socialization of forest properties plans of a quite contrary nature. They proceeded by legislation to abolish the peasants' obligatory service in the state forests, in return for cession of land; thus, instead of socializing the forests, they divided them up among the peasants."

We see then that here, also, so-called socialization aroused the peasants' hostility, just as it had done in Bavaria. According to the Social-Democratic interpretation, the demand in 1918-1919 for the abolition of war-time legislation was a "counter-revolutionary" struggle against "planned economy"; the demand for the land of the big landlords was a move against socialization. And Otto Bauer believed that he had made a considerable contribution to Marxism by the following utterly false conception (from the book above cited):

". . . large and middle peasants . . . have no . . . revolutionary traditions. Until 1918, they were in the camp of the Hapsburg counter-revolution, and in their hearts they are still there. . . . Their republicanism is really their fear of the Czechs. The manly love for freedom—without which true democracy is not possible—is alien to them. . . ."

In contrast to this, let us take the findings of an objective bourgeois historian:

"The attitude of the peasant population towards the revolution was far more favorable than the reports of the workers' councils [on the basis of a questionnaire.—O.F.] indicated. The latter, in their judgment, confused the attitude of the peasant population with that towards themselves. The peasant who welcomed

the revolution nevertheless need not be an adherent of the workers' councils." *

Thus wrote Mattes of Bavaria. This applied, however, equally to other parts of Germany and to Austria. The attitude of the peasants towards the workers' councils was determined by the attitude of the councils towards the peasants. Under the influence of Social-Democracy, the workers' councils considered it "counter-revolutionary" if the peasants did not agree with what they did. The peasants disliked the policy of the Social-Democratic Party because this policy was inimical to the peasants. This is proved, to a considerable extent, by the fact that the peasants were in the camp of the counter-revolution. For it was first the policy of Social-Democracy which prepared the ground in the countryside for counter-revolution.

IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

Thanks to the policy of Social-Democracy, fascism in the act of seizing power was able to depend upon the middle classes and peasantry. Once in power, however, it did not hesitate to make adequate return for the aid of the city and rural petty bourgeoisie, in the form of the abolition of all liberties, of the establishment of a physical, intellectual and moral slavery which has no precedent in history. Fascism also rewarded them by the forcible expropriation of the petty proprietors.

The land robbery of the old feudal lords was revived in new forms. The decline and pauperization of the peasantry appeared not to have been checked but accelerated, and assumed a more brutal and coercive character. Fascism has itself severed the bond by which it was able to lead the peasantry into the struggle against the revolutionary working class. The way has now been made clear for a new alliance of workers and peasants, in a struggle against fascism and the rule of capital.

In 1918, Social-Democracy betrayed the revolution. In the meantime, according to the model and under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin and Stalin, Communist Parties have come into existence. In Spain, the young Communist Party knew how to establish a solid alliance of the working class with the peasantry, in the struggle against fascism and against foreign intervention. It was able to intensify this alliance in the struggle against the Trotskyite P.O.U.M. which, at the orders of fascism, sought to disrupt the unity of peasants and workers by "radical," coercive measures of "socialization."

Under the leadership of the Gestapo, the Trotskyites have refined and amplified the fatal methods of "complete socialization" which Neurath in the days of the Bavarian Soviet Republic practiced against the will of the young Communist Party, in order to strangle the revolution on the pretense of radicalism. But the vigilance of the Communist Party of Spain has frustrated this stratagem of the counter-revolution.

"Ten or twenty years of correct relations with the peasantry, and victory on a world scale is assured (even if the proletarian revolutions now developing are delayed); otherwise, twenty or forty years of horrors of White Guard terrorism." *

These words of Lenin have been proved to be shatteringly true in the widest sense for Germany and Austria; while the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union was ensured by the establishment of "correct relations with the peasantry" by the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

The working class, and particularly all the Communist Parties, have the urgent and imperative obligation to root out the very last vestige of Social-Democratism in the peasant question. This alone can lead to a solid people's front, and to the coming victorious revolution against fascism.

---

* Wilhelm Mattes: *Die Bayrischen Bauernräte* (*The Bavarian Peasant Councils*), Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921.

* V. I. Lenin, quoted by Stalin in *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 78. International Publishers, New York.

Soviet Culture

BY A. CLAIRE

TWO sailors were bathing in a harbor in the Soviet Union. One was a Russian, the other an Englishman. The Englishman knew a little Russian, the Russian rather more English. The Englishman dived carelessly and was knocked unconscious. The Russian pulled him out of the water, sent a boy for camphor and a syringe, and gave him an injection. The Englishman came round, saw the stethoscope and the syringe, and was amazed. It transpired that both were doctors. The Russian had been a sailor, had just finished his medical training, and had come on leave to visit his old shipmates. The Englishman, on the other hand, had become a sailor because he could not find work as a doctor. The one had reached the medical profession from below, the other had sunk down in exactly the opposite manner. This is a true story, typical of the present-day world.

Two worlds, two fates. Two kinds of intellectuals, the one rising from the masses, the other hunting for crusts, trying to find a meaning for his life, standing between two camps, between the workers, to whom the future belongs, and the bourgeoisie, which represents the oppression of yesterday and the bitterness of today.

* * *

The intelligentsia of the Soviet Union is new in two ways. In the first place, because its ranks are daily being reinforced by new men—workers, peasants, children of the people, who, in other countries can rise only in exceptional circumstances. Secondly because, for the first time in history, culture serves only the people.

"Formerly it had to serve the rich classes for it could do nothing else Now it must serve the people, for the exploiting classes have ceased to exist." *

From these two new features of the Soviet intelligentsia follows another discovery—the role it plays in Soviet society. In the Soviet Union today, they say "Science is the salt of the earth."

Stalin's words of 1928 have now become established facts:

"The working class cannot become the real master of the country if it does not know how to rid itself of ignorance, if it does not know how to create its own intelligentsia, if it does not master science and does not know how to conduct its economy on a scientific basis."

The people are now putting this economic program of action into practice. The new intelligentsia is the product of the people itself, and the people have given it first place in its whole creative activity. Soviet intellectuals do not form an "aristocracy of the mind," nor do they stand *above* the workers, *above* the people. They are the most advanced section *of the people itself*, its most educated, original and responsible part.

* * *

The whole country is learning. Neither age, sex, nor nationality prevent study. The schools have 33,000,000 pu-

* *Stalin on the New Soviet Constitution*, p. 8. International Publishers, New York.

pils. There are 600,000 university students, about 100,000 more than in the 23 capitalist countries of Europe put together. The number of students accepted during the past academic year was 166,000, two and a half times as many as the total number of students in all the universities of Germany.

Moreover, 268 out of every thousand people in the Soviet Union are studying something or other. These 42,500,000 people—more numerous than the inhabitants of France—are educating themselves. Everyone is studying—workers, collective farmers, women, graybeards, youth fresh from the universities. When a worker gets a job, he is not only paid his wages, but also told how, without giving up his work, he can learn something or other. The pupil does not have to pay for his lessons, but indeed gets paid for attending them.

Children grow up in the knowledge that every road is open to them. The other day some children were discussing that favorite question, "What shall I be when I am grown-up?" A very small child said, "I shall be an airman, and an artist on my day off." Neither children nor grown-ups were surprised. The children all chose two or three professions—"for every day" and for their "day off." Children and grown-ups alike know that you can achieve anything, and that nothing is impossible if you are determined, as the Bolsheviks understand determination, to learn, to learn, always to learn.

Polina Ossipenko looked after the chickens on her collective farm. She wanted to become a pilot, and after five or six years she attained first rank. Constantin Ivanov, formerly a *bezprizhorni* (homeless waif), built up a regiment of the Red Army. He wanted to become a musician, and after seven years he won an all-Union competition for conductors. One comes across surprises like that at every step of Soviet life. Surprises they still are, but no longer, in the Soviet Union, exceptions.

* * *

Soviet intellectuals are not a handful of the chosen, but a powerful army.

Lenin himself analyzed the statistics of the all-Russian census of 1897. That was long ago, but to what extent have the fortunes of other peoples changed during that time? Much has indeed changed, but the basis remains the same. Grandchildren must toil as their grandfathers did, the barrier between educated and uneducated remains, the gulf between rich and poor, oppressor and oppressed has not been closed. Only the fate of those peoples who now inhabit the Soviet Union has changed. Here it is as if centuries had passed.

Lenin calculated that in 1897 there were 4,010 engineers in all Russia. In 1937, in Soviet heavy industry alone, there were more than 600,000 engineers, and some thousand more were about to get their diplomas. In 1897, the schoolmasters of Russia numbered 79,000, there were 295,000 priests and monks, and 300,000 keepers of brothels. The Soviet Union has some 950,000 teachers, and produced another 30,000 in 1937 alone.

In 1897 there were 16,956 doctors and 14,000 quacks. Today 100,000 are employed in the health services of the Soviet Union. Moreover, the geographical distribution of doctors has changed. In the most cultured center of Russia, Moscow, there were then 1,380 doctors. Today there are more than 3,300 in Soviet Georgia, and more than 2,500 in Soviet Uzbekistan. There is no corner, from the Arctic Ocean to the Pamirs, without a doctor, a well-equipped hospital, and X-ray apparatus.

But one must not make comparisons only with the past, and only with Russia's past. In 1931, there were 190,000 teachers in Germany: in the fourth year of the fascist dictatorship there were less than 183,000. When Hitler came to power, Germany had 51,000 doctors; three years later there were less than 48,000. Germany, formerly famous for its skilled engineers, will, in 1940, turn out only 120 new electrical engineers, and only 300 mechanical engineers. In 1928 4,900 students entered this faculty of the universities; in 1936 only 1,570. We see a startling decline in Germany, and a rapid increase in the Soviet Union.

The contradictions between town and country are disappearing, which is reflected in the distribution of Soviet intellectuals in city and country.

There are some 5,000 engineers on the staff of the Kirov factory. Of these, about 500, Party and non-Party Bolsheviks, were promoted to leading industrial positions during last year. Tomsk, where the tsarist government used to send students, professors, and workers whom it thought unreliable, now has 20,000 students, and 3,000 teachers and professors. In recent years, 4,210 specialists and 1,000 technical workers passed through the Tomsk medical college.

In the Soviet Republic of Armenia is the flourishing Sverdlov collective farm, whose cash income this year exceeded two million rubles. The farm's chief pride is not in that figure, but in its own rural culture. Besides its 1,500 collective farmers, it has 28 teachers, 29 vine-growing specialists, two agricultural experts and two on agricultural machinery, 22 Stakhanovite cotton planters, who are also expert gardeners and have constructed a fine Park of Rest and Culture. There are librarians, doctors, accountants, veterinary surgeons, and the staff of the maternity home, and an electrician and a cinema operator. Altogether there are more than one hundred people who can be classed as intellectuals on this one collective farm.

Metchetinskaya is an ordinary Cossack *stanitsa** on the Don. In this community there are 60 teachers and the intellectuals total 150.

In the villages of the Soviet Union there are 560,000 teachers, 160,000 people in the health services, 40,000 expert agriculturalists, 220,000 surveyors, agricultural engineers, and veterinary surgeons. There are also 25,000 actors, stage hands, musicians, and the like. That gives you some idea of what a Soviet village is like.

That class exclusiveness, that unhealthy seclusion of the intelligentsia, which was responsible for its slavish illusions and prejudices, its miserable and harmful groups and castes, has disappeared. The influx of healthy proletarian blood has enriched and transformed Soviet culture.

At the head of the Soviet intellectuals stand Stakhanov, a miner, and Papanin, a sailor. Men like the Nikita Isotov, the coal-cutter, Smetanin, the shoemaker, Alexander Ognev and Peter Krivonos, engine-drivers, Mussinsky, a carpenter, and Blidmann, a porter—these are the leaders of the host of Soviet technicians. These men are the links between the workers and their intellectuals. They have not only discarded many of the so-called "laws" of the old science, but they have produced new laws, and opened up new paths.

The American scholar Wilcox laid down the "law" for the maximum production of sugar-beet as 1,200 centners per hectare (a little over a half ton per acre).

Utenbergenov, an unknown collective farmer, son of a goatherd, not only overthrew the theory of the "limits" set by Wilcox the scholar, but in 1936 he threw out this challenge to all the timid so-called scholars: "Maybe someone will say my harvest of 1,410 centners per hectare was due to a chance trick of nature. I will reply: in our country things do not depend on chance. Next year I will hand over to the state at least 1,500 centners per hectare." And he did.

Behind these leaders is a whole army of young theoreticians and practical men, eagerly transforming their country, stopping at no difficulty, conquering every obstacle to their progress.

A short time ago the Young Communist League of the Soviet Union held a competition for young scholars, in which 8,000 took part. Over 3,000 of the best theses were selected, and finally 615 of the most outstanding were chosen for the all-Union competition. The judges were the most famous of Soviet scholars. Two theses received the highest prizes. One was by Professor Sobolzhev, 27-year-old professor of mathematics, whose works are respected at Oxford and Cambridge. The second scholar was

* Large Cossack village.

no older. He was Vlasov, whose study of the movement of wheat northwards, following the introduction of Lysenko's method, was praised highly by leading Soviet agriculturalists.

These 27-year-old professors, Sobolzhev and Vlasov, are working in the Soviet army of science alongside scholars like Williams, whose seventy-fifth birthday the Soviet Union has just celebrated, Keller, Komarov, President of the Academy of Learning, and Bach. These men who have grown gray in the service of science are encouraging the younger generation, and rejoicing at its successes. None of them, however, would care to be considered less young than his young colleagues. In the boisterous youth of Soviet culture, their youth is preserved.

These world-famous old scholars are not working alone on the original developments in Soviet science. In the advancing academic world of old Russia there were new men with big ideas. Some dreamed of harnessing the swift-flowing Dnieper, and of tapping the great mineral resources of the Far East, of Central Asia, and of the Arctic. Today these dreams have been realized. Dnieprostroi, the White Sea Canal, the Moscow-Volga Canal, the Central Asiatic coalfields of Karaganda, Magnitogorsk, the new towns of Kirovsk and Montchegorsk on the Kolski peninsula, all these exist. The progressive scientists of the old regime and the younger scientists have worked together to achieve them.

* * *

Nikolai Virta, the author, wrote a book called *Loneliness*, about the kulak revolt which had harassed the former Tambov government for two years during the civil war. The Art Theatre adapted this novel into a play, called *The Land*, in which Chmelev took the part of Ivan Storoshev, the kulak. On May 9, 1938, about a year after the publication of Virta's outstanding book, the following short announcement appeared in the Soviet press.

"Ivan Storoshev, the kulak who escaped twice when under arrest, and who continued his anti-Soviet activities, has been captured. He had got a job at a railway station under a false name."

This is an example of the living history which serves the art of the Soviet Union.

Nikolai Tikonov the author and Leo Arnstamm the film director made a film which they called *Friends*. The film showed Kirov leading the people of the Caucasus during the civil war.

Author and director shot the scenes at the very places where Kirov had been at the time. When the man who was playing the part of Kirov entered the mountain village, he was greeted, as Kirov had been nineteen years before, with joyful cries of "Kirov has come, welcome Kirov!" When the battle in the mountains was being filmed, people whom Kirov himself had led nineteen years before came from all over the Caucasus.

But none of them wanted to act the part of the Whites. Finally they had drawn lots to decide as to who should be the Whites. Old women came out of the villages to curse the Whites, as they had done nineteen years ago. While shooting the scene in which the Red Army comes to the help of the peasants, all the horsemen who were not supposed to be taking part galloped uninvited behind the Red cavalry, shouting at the top of their voices.

Director and author were greatly moved by the ardent affection of the people for Kirov, the Red Army, and the heroic memories of the war of liberation. They promised their thousands of new friends to call the film *Friends*. The film was shown first of all to those heroes who had once experienced the struggles, and who had repeated them for the film.

The director Rappoport made the film *Professor Mamlock*. It was shown when the shameful Munich betrayal was being enacted, when the Soviet millions were greeting every report from Prague, London and Paris with clenched fists. The film became a war-cry against fascism. Professor Mamlock sarcastically informs his fascist assistant that he had not noticed any difference, when he was

wounded at Verdun, between his Jewish blood and the "Aryan" blood of the other German soldiers. The audience applauded for minutes on end. Professor Mamlock, who had previously spoken contemptuously of the growing cases of "political surgery" in his clinic and had refused to accept into his clinic workers wounded by the fascists, prophesies, under the bullets of the S.A. men, their own imminent defeat. He dies with a greeting to the free Germany of the future on his lips.

The entire audience demonstrated its ardent solidarity with the enslaved German people and the new, free Germany.

Vassily Lebedyev-Kumatch writes poems, Dunayevski and Shostokovich set them to music, and, almost the next day, the whole Soviet people is singing the song. And these songs are not sung in the Soviet Union alone, but by soldiers in the trenches of republican Spain, by workers in London and Paris, by lovers of the Soviet Union all over the world. The grateful people have elected Lebedyev-Kumatch the poet and Dunayevski the composer to the Supreme Soviet of the R.S.F.S.R.

Trofim Lysenko, non-Party agricultural expert, was the son of a Ukrainian peasant. In 1929 he told the respectable agriculturalists that the conceptions of autumn and spring-sown grain were only relative, and that he had found a way of turning "winter wheat" into "summer wheat." The respectable agriculturalists laughed at the "over-enthusiastic boy," but the people and the government supported him. Millions of collective farmers did as Lysenko suggested, and in 1937 Lysenko's method resulted in an unprecedented harvest from nine million hectares. The increase which his method, vernatization, has produced in the U.S.S.R. during the last five years amounts to one hundred and fifty million poods. The brilliant farmer Lysenko is now Vice-Chairman of the Council of the U.S.S.R. He holds two Orders and his fame as a scholar has spread far and wide.

* * *

We are living in difficult times. The second imperialist war is extending. At this moment, when the forces of peace and war threaten to come into conflict, it may be considered an inopportune moment to write about Soviet intellectuals and their new position in society, or to celebrate their peaceful victories. We reject this idea, because the new culture which is growing in the Soviet Union is an important bulwark of the forces for peace, for their victory over the warmongering barbarians. The bread which they grow, the steel which they temper, and the spirit which they breed, strengthen the whole human race.

On the Form of Party Propaganda in Relation To the Publication of the "Short History Of the C.P.S.U."

A RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C.P.S.U.

I.

THE publication of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* is the greatest event in the ideological life of the Bolshevik Party. With the appearance of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* the Party has received a new, powerful weapon of Bolshevism, an encyclopedia of fundamental knowledge in the field of Marxism-Leninism. The *Short History* is a scientific history of Bolshevism. In it, the vast experience of the Communist Party, which neither had nor has its equal in any party in the world, is explained and generalized.

The *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* is the most important means of fulfilling the task of mastering Bolshevism and equipping Party members with Marxist-Leninist theory, in other words, with a knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle; it is a means of enhancing the political vigilance of Bolsheviks, both with and without Party membership cards, a means towards raising the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism to worthy theoretical level.

In the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. had in mind the following tasks:

1. It was necessory to give the Party a uniform manual of Party history, a manual representing the official treatment of the chief questions of the history of the C.P.S.U. and of Marxism-Leninism, tested by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., and which would admit of no capricious interpretation. Through the publication of *The Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, approved by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., an end has been put to caprice and confusion in the exposition of Party history, to the whole volume of varied viewpoints and arbitrary interpretations of the most important questions of Party theory and Party history, which existed in a number of previously published courses on Party history.

2. By the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. undertook the task of eliminating the pernicious separation which had been made in recent years in the field of propaganda, between Marxism and Leninism, and which led to the fact that some began to teach Leninism as an independent body of teaching, separate from Marxism, separate from dialectical and historical materialism, and separate from the history of the Party, forgetting that Leninism originated and developed on the foundation of Marxism, that Marxism is the basis of Leninism, and that it is impossible to understand Leninism unless one also knows this, the foundation of Leninism.

In the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of providing a manual of the theory and history of the C.P.S.U. in which the artificially dissociated components of uniform

Marxist-Leninist teaching—of dialectical and historical materialism and Leninism, of historical materialism, but linked up with the policy of the Party—would be brought together into one united whole; a manual in which the indestructible unity, completeness and consistency of the teaching of Marx and Lenin, the unity of Marxism-Leninism, would be demonstrated; in which the new, which Lenin and his pupils brought to Marxist theory, on the basis of the generalization of new experiences of the class struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, would be represented.

3. Contrary to many old manuals, which represented the history of the C.P.S.U. chiefly through historical personalities and aimed at the development of personnel through personalities and their biographies, the *Short History* deals with Party history on the basis of the development of the main conceptions of Marxism-Leninism, and aims at the development of personnel primarily on the basis of the *ideas* of Marxism-Leninism.

In producing the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. approached the problem from the point of view of teaching Marxism-Leninism on the basis of historical facts. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. had in view the fact that such an exposition of Marxist-Leninist theory best represents the interests of the case that the basic ideas of Marxism-Leninism can be best, most naturally and most comprehensibly demonstrated by means of historical facts; for the history of the C.P.S.U. is in itself Marxism in action; for the correctness and vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory is tested in practice through the experiences of the class struggle of the proletariat; and Marxist-Leninist theory itself has developed and enriched itself in the closest association with practice on the basis of the generalization of the practical experience of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

4. In the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of liberating Marxist literature from superficiality and vulgarization in the exposition of a number of questions of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and of the history of the Party.

This type of vulgarization and superficiality found expression, for example, in the opinions—expounded until quite recently, obviously anti-Marxist, and long since condemned by the Party—with regard to the role of personalities in history, when the question of the role of personalities in history was represented by certain pseudo-theorists and pseudo-propagandists in a quasi-social-revolutionary manner.

The incorrect exposition of the question of the victory of socialism in our country belongs to this type of vulgarization and shallowness in Marxism-Leninism.

Distortions of Marxist-Leninist conceptions of the character of war in the present epoch were widespread, as were also a lack of comprehension of the distinction between justified and unjustified wars, and the incorrect opinion that the Bolsheviks are "pacifists" in their own fashion.

In the science of history, the anti-Marxist distortions and vulgarizations were until quite recently connected with the so-called "school" of Pokrovsky which represented historical facts distortedly, elucidated them, in spite of historical materialism, from the standpoint of the present, but not from the standpoint of those conditions under which the historical events took place, thus distorting true history.

The falsification of history, in contradiction to the reality of history, the attempts to embellish history instead of representing it faithfully, led, for example, to the fact that in our propaganda the history of the Party was sometimes presented as purely a triumphal progression, without any temporary defeats or setbacks, obviously thus contradicting historical truth and hindering the correct training of personnel.

Anti-Marxist vulgarization and confusion also showed itself in the dissemination of incorrect conceptions of

the Soviet state, in the disparagement of the role and the significance of the socialist state as the chief weapon in the hands of the workers and peasants for the victory of socialism and for the defense against the capitalist world of the socialist achievements of the working people.

The *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* puts an end to these and similar instances of vulgarization and superficiality in treating Marxism-Leninism and re-establishes the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

5. In the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of clearly demonstrating the strength and significance of Marxist-Leninist theory, which scientifically reveals the laws of social development, of the theory which teaches how to utilize these laws as a guide to the revolutionary action of the proletariat; the theory which, like all science, is constantly developing and improving, and which does not fear to replace this or that obsolete thesis or conclusion by theses or conclusions which represent new historical conditions.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. started from the viewpoint that without a knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, without mastery of Bolshevism, without overcoming their theoretical backwardness, our personnel would be gravely trammelled; for the task of correctly leading all branches of socialist construction demands that the practical workers master the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory, that they be guided by theory in the solution of questions of practical work.

It is a mistake to assume that only a small circle of functionaries can master theory. The mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory is by no means unattainable. Precisely at the present time, under Soviet power and in view of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., unlimited opportunities have been created for our leading personnel to master successfully Marxist-Leninist theory, to study the history of the Party and the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In order to master the theory of Marxism-Leninism one needs only the will, perseverance and strength of character for the attainment of this end. If it be possible to master such sciences as physics, chemistry and biology, for example, there is even less reason to doubt one's capacity for completely mastering the science of Marxism-Leninism.

6. In the production of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of aiding the personnel which is engaged in theoretical and propagandist work to transform themselves, to improve the quality of their work, to eliminate their theoretical backwardness, to remove the insufficiencies and deficiencies in their ideological training, and to raise propagandist work to a worthy level.

All these tasks, which the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. undertook, have been solved by the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*

II.

Wherein lie the chief deficiencies in propaganda work?

In what direction must the propagandist and theoretical work of the Party be reconstructed?

1. The chief deficiency in Party propaganda is the lack of the necessary centralization of the direction of Party propaganda, and the consequent rule-of-thumb methods and lack of organization in the propaganda.

Rule-of-thumb methods and lack of organization in the sphere of propaganda are chiefly expressed in the fact that Party organizations have chosen oral propaganda in study circles as the chief form of propaganda, thus forgetting that the study-circle method of propaganda was predominantly peculiar to the illegal period of the Party, expressing the working conditions of the Party at that time, and that under the conditions of the Soviet power, when the Bolshevik Party has at its hands such a powerful instrument of propaganda as the press, entirely new conditions and opportunities have been created for an unrestricted degree of propaganda and for the centralizing of its direction.

Instead of utilizing these opportunities,

however, Party organizations continue to cling to the old forms of propaganda, and fail to take into account the fact that under present conditions study circles can no longer constitute the chief method of training our personnel in Bolshevism, that the chief method of training personnel in Marxism-Leninism must be the method—tested in practice by the older generation of Bolsheviks—of independent study of the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party; but, in this connection, the Party must come to the aid of personnel on questions arising in the course of study, through the press and through a highly-qualified, centralized consulting body, by means of courses, lectures, and so on.

Party organizations which chose oral propaganda in study circles as the chief form of propaganda permitted themselves to be led by the false conception of organizing all Communists into study circles; they aimed at the quantitative extension of the network of the Party study circle, at striving for the complete "inclusion" of all Communists —for whom participation was obligatory, without exception—in the Party study circles.

In their strivings for a large number of circles, Party organizations let fall from their hands the most important link in the chain—the quality of the propaganda.

The superfluity of study circles, which deprived the Party organizations of the possibility of controlling the nature of the propaganda, led to the Party organizations permitting the direction of propaganda to slip from their hands; their activity consisted chiefly in the collection of statistical material on the "enrolment" of Communists in the study circles, their numerical strength and the number of visits to the circles. The upshot was that the circles were transformed into autonomous, uncontrolled organizations, carrying on their work at their own risk and peril.

Furthermore, the superabundance of study circles led to the propagandists being crowded to excess with people who were poorly trained theoretically and frequently politically uneducated and untested; who were unable to help the Party members and non-Party people to master Bolshevism, but, on the other hand, were only capable of substituting for the presentation of Marxist-Leninist theory an injurious superficiality, thus confusing their listeners.

In their striving for a large number of propagandists, the Party organizations permitted the theoretical direction of training, the further education of propagandists, and control over the work of propagandists in the circles, to escape their hands. Instead of centralizing the direction of propagandists, thus ensuring an improvement in the quality of work among propagandists, Party organizations also, in this respect, mistakenly aimed at large numbers, dispersing the aid for propagandists by the establishment of a large number of Party education departments* in the factories, of training schools for propagandists, of short courses for propagandists, and so on. The striving for a quantity of such institutions, at the cost of their quality, led to the Party education department and the training schools for propagandists being deprived of the necessary Party leadership, and the lack of qualified personnel as leaders of training schools for propagandists and Party offices led to a decrease in the quality of their work, to dissatisfaction among propagandists with the state of things, and converted attendance at training courses and Party education departments into a formal obligation.

In connection with the fact that Party organizations made attendance at study circles an obligatory duty for Party members, that they looked upon Party comrades as permanent pupils of the elementary classes, incapable of the independent study of Marxism-Leninism, they had recourse to a whole series of administrative expedients in order to en-

---

* "Party Cabinet," center of Party education; a special room set aside for a library, with magazines, periodicals, etc., with consultants for advising propagandists, etc.

roll Party members in the circles and keep them there, they embarked on methods of petty supervision and of the regulation of activities of Communists in the circles.

Incorrect, pedantic methods, restricting the ideological and political development of Party members, were rooted in the activities of the circles, and were manifest in the establishment of "uniform training courses" for all circles, of uniform regulations for work and in the suppression of unrestricted discussion and comradely debate in the study circles.

Not restricting themselves to this, the Party organizations also lapsed into the bureaucratic and harmful conception of "controlling" everyone who read a Marxist-Leninist book and forcing him to give an account of what he had read.

The result of this incorrect attitude towards propaganda work is that Communists who throughout several years were obliged to visit one and the same study circle, and who lacked suitable assistance in their home studies, lost interest in theoretical training; and attendance at the study circle frequently became an oppressive burden.

The violation of the principle of voluntary enrollment in study circles, the bureaucratic-administrative practice of the mechanical, compulsory inclusion of Party members in the circles; the incorrect estimation of the circles as the sole form of Party training, undermined the belief among Party members that they could successfully study Marxism-Leninism by means of independent reading. In this manner, an injury was done to the interests of thorough, independent assimilation of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism by Communists, to the ideological development of Party personnel.

The belief in their power and capacity to master Marxist-Leninist theory must be restored to the Communists.

It is necessary to destroy the harmful conception that Marxism-Leninism can be studied only in study circles; for in reality the chief and basic method of studying Marxism-Leninism is in independent reading.

2. One of the chief causes of the excessive exaggeration of study circle work and oral propaganda, mainly at the expense of press propaganda, was the injurious disconnection between the organization of press propaganda and that of oral propaganda, which found expression in the existence, side by side, of propaganda departments and press departments in the area committees, the district committees, and the Central Committees of the various national Communist Parties, as well as in the apparatus of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

In the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the most important weapon must be the press: reviews, newspapers, pamphlets, to which oral propaganda should constitute an aid and support. Inasmuch as the press has the capacity of making the truth about this or that matter common property at one stroke, it is more powerful than oral propaganda. The separation of the direction of propaganda into two departments led to a depreciation of the role of the press in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, and thereby to a restriction in the extent of Bolshevik propaganda, to rule-of-thumb methods and disorganization.

The departments for Party propaganda and agitation, which limited their activities to oral propaganda and strove for numerical increase of study circles, have not made full use of the Party press for propaganda purposes, and in the final result have deprived themselves of the possibility of directing propaganda in essentials.

The press departments, from which the requisite, qualified propagandists—who had devoted themselves almost exclusively to oral propaganda—had been taken away, proved themselves incapable of carrying on the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism through the press.

3. The most important defect in Party propaganda is the underestimation of political education, of Marxist-Leninist steeling of our personnel, of our Soviet intelligentsia—the personnel of the Party, of the Young Communist League, of the Soviet, industry, the cooperatives,

trade unions, agriculture, the school system and the army through the Party organizations; in other words, the personnel in the apparatus of the Party, state and the collective farms, with whose help the working class and peasantry of the Soviet land govern. The practice of our Party propaganda, which concentrated chiefly upon the enrollment of the workers at the work-bench, was to ignore the leading personnel, our Soviet, Party and non-Party intelligentsia which consists of former workers and peasants.

One of the tasks of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* is to terminate this absurd, anti-Leninist, derogatory attitude towards our Soviet intelligentsia, and towards the requirements of their political, Leninist training.

The *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* appeals in the first place to the leading personnel of the Party, of the Y.C.L. and of industry, and to other functionaries, to our entire Party and non-Party intelligentsia in town and country.

Our Party, Soviet, industrial and other leading Leninist personnel, who are engaged in practical work, have fallen considerably behind in the field of theory. When the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. produced the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* it undertook the task of beginning the elimination of this theoretical and political backwardness of our cadres

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. proceeded from the standpoint that

". . . if we succeed in giving ideological training to our Party cadres from top to bottom and steeling them politically so that they can find their bearings with ease in the internal and international situation, if we succeed in making of them fully mature Leninists and Marxists capable of solving the questions of the leadership of the country without making serious mistakes, then we can thereby solve nine-tenths of all our tasks." *

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. proceeded from the standpoint that the art of Bolshevik leadership demands a knowledge of theory, in other words, of the laws of the development of society, the laws of the development of the working class movement, the development of the proletarian revolution, the development of socialist construction, and the ability to apply these laws in practical work in the field of leadership of socialist construction.

All our personnel form the mighty army of the Soviet intelligentsia. The Soviet intelligentsia is bound by all its roots to the working class and peasantry. It is a completely new intelligentsia, without equal in any other country.

No country could or can go ahead without its intelligentsia, and least of all the socialist state of the workers and peasants. Our intelligentsia, which has grown up during the years of Soviet power, is composed of that personnel of the state apparatus with whose help the working class pursues its internal and foreign policy. They are former workers and peasants and the sons of workers and peasants, who have been advanced to leading positions. The intelligentsia is of particular importance in a country like ours where the state directs all economic and cultural activities, including agriculture, and where every government functionary must understand the policy of the state and its tasks, both at home and abroad, in order to carry on his work understandingly and successfully.

Thus, the task of the Marxist-Leninist training of the Soviet intelligentsia is one of the primary and most important tasks of the Party of the Bolsheviks.

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. has substantiated the fact that the derogatory attitude towards our intelligenstia, in spite of the important part they play in the Soviet state, has not been overcome, even to this very day, which implies the extremely harmful application to our own intelligentsia of those conceptions of, and attitudes towards, the intelligentsia which were propagated in the pre-revolutionary period, when they were in the service of the landlords and capitalists.

---

* Joseph Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, p. 37, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

This derogatory attitude towards the intelligentsia finds expression in the neglect of the ideological training of personnel, in the abandonment of political work among the intelligentsia, employees, teachers, doctors, students, the intelligentsia of the collective farms, and so on, in a derogatory attitude towards the Party and non-Party intellectual, as towards a human being of a secondary order, even if he be a Stakhanovite of yesterday who, in virtue of his merits, has been appointed to a leading position in the Soviet state.

Such an anti-Bolshevik attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia is repugnant and churlish and dangerous to the Soviet state. It must be realized that it is precisely the neglect of political work among the intelligentsia, among our personnel, which led to the fact that a part of our personnel, which stood outside the political influence of the Party and which lacked political steeling, went astray politically, lost their way and became the prey of foreign espionage services and their Trotskyite-Bukharinite and bourgeois-nationalist agencies.

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. is of the opinion that an end must be put to this anti-Leninist attitude a la Makhaisky* towards the intelligentsia. It is necessary that the Soviet intelligentsia be educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Without such an intelligentsia, the Soviet government cannot successfully lead the country.

The *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* is a means towards such education of the Soviet intelligentsia.

---

* W. K. Makhaisky belonged to the Marxists until the nineties. Later he followed the Economists and, like them, represented the view that the working class is not justified in carrying on a political struggle but should concentrate on economic struggles. When the Marxist intelligentsia led the working class along the path of the political struggle, Makhaisky's supporters issued the slogan: "Down with the intelligentsia!" Later, Makhaisky went over to the camp of open counter-revolution.

III.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. resolves:

1. That the practice of striving after the quantitative inclusion of Communists through the study circle network of Party training at the expense of the quality of the propaganda, which leads to the dispersing of forces and the lowering of the level of propaganda work, shall be considered as incorrect.

2. That the Party organizations be obliged to eliminate organizational rule-of-thumb methods in Party propaganda, to establish the necessary centralization in its direction, and so to transform Party propaganda that the raising of its quality and of its ideological level be ensured.

3. To take the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* as a basis for the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

The study of the history of the C.P.S.U. is to be differentiated in the following manner:

For the *lower* group of the personnel, in which there is a considerable number of insufficiently trained comrades, it is advisable to study the course within smaller compass, according to three chief stages of the history of the Party: (1) The struggle for the creation of the Bolshevik Party (Chapters I to IV); (2) The Party of the Bolsheviks in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat (Chapters V to VII); (3) The Party of the Bolsheviks in power (Chapters VIII to XII).

For the *middle* group, which consists of relatively better trained comrades and which is the strongest group numerically of our personnel, the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. recommends the study of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* in its full compass, according to the twelve chapters it contains.

For the *higher* group, for the best trained comrades—the study of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* should be accompanied by the simultaneous study of the corresponding works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, according to

the sources given, section by section in each chapter.

4. Arising from the fact that the chief method of study of Marxism-Leninism must be the method of independent study, the area, district and central committees of the national Communist Parties are instructed to reduce the number of Party training circles.

In the place of the dozens and sometimes hundreds of study circles now existing in each large factory, in institutions and universities, it will prove suitable, by a proper approach to the matter, to have in larger factories and the bigger institutions, about two or three circles for the lower group, two or three circles for the middle group, and one circle of a higher type for the most developed and trained persons; and in the universities, a few circles of the middle and higher type.

In the rural areas, where the desire exists to study the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* in study circles, and in which trained propagandists can be found, a few circles can be formed for the village intelligentsia: the Party and Soviet "actives," the teachers, the trade and cooperative employees, the collective farm "actives," and so on.

In the reduction of the number of circles, the task must be borne in mind of ensuring really trained propagandists for the existing circles.

5. That the administrative-bureaucratic practice of the compulsory inclusion of Communists in the Party training circles be stopped.

That it be explained to every Communist that participation in the study circles is absolutely voluntary.

6. The work of the circles must be built up on the basis of lively discussion and comradely debate. The harmful pedantic-administrative methods, the red-tape and routine, which restrict the ideological training of Bolsheviks, both with and without Party cards, must definitely be eliminated. The propagandists must explain in a comradely manner the questions which interest the members of the circles.

An end must be made to the formal, bureaucratic regulation of study circle work, as, for example: a uniform day for Party training, a two-hour lesson immediately after work, discouraging the putting of practical questions which would interest the members of the circle, and so on. The schedule of each circle must be drawn up by the members, together with the propagandists, and with reference to local conditions. Each lesson should last just as long as the the circle members deem necessary for the fundamental consideration of the questions treated.

The work of the study circles must be so organized that the instruction does not extend over too long a time. One of the basic deficiencies of the present circles, which must be avoided, is to devote unlimited time to the earlier subjects, thus failing to study the period subsequent to the October Revolution, which is of great importance in the history of the Party.

The circles for the study of Party history must be composed so as to ensure a more or less equal level of general and political knowledge of the members. In accordance with these levels, three types of circles, in accordance with the three differentiated types of study as follows, are recommended:

A. Circles for the lower group of personnel, which will study the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* in restricted compass, with simple explanations of theoretical questions;

B. Circles for the middle group, which will study the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* as an entirety, chapter by chapter;

C. Circles for the most highly trained comrades, who will study the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* by accompanying each section with simultaneous reading of sources.

7. That lectures be organized; these belong among the most important propaganda methods of Marxism-Leninism. A well-prepared, comprehensive lecture would be of real assistance to the comrades who are independently studying the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* and the classes of Marxism-Leninism. Fur-

thermore, lectures should be held dealing with questions of the international situation and various theoretical and political questions. It would be useful for the lecturer to answer questions after his lecture. Public lectures, with a small admission fee, should be inaugurated.

8. Rule-of-thumb methods and the lack of coordination in the work of propagandists, which was expressed in the effort to set up as many Party education departments and training schools for propagandists as possible, must be eliminated. Party organizations are obliged, within a two-months' term, to examine the network of Party educational departments to reduce their number, and, as a general rule, leave to the town and area committees of the Party the Party education departments for aid to propagandists and for consultation by persons who are engaged in political self-education.

The Party education departments in factories and institutions which possess no qualified consultants must be given up, or used as reading-rooms and libraries for persons who are engaged in individual study. The Party organizations are obliged to reduce the number of training schools for propagandists, and to concentrate the work of these training schools for propagandists upon the big Party committees in the town districts, the town committees, district and provincial committees.

In the establishment of training schools for propagandists, the Party organizations must secure leaders for them who are trained Marxists, and are politically tested. The town, district and provincial committees of the C.P.S.U. must exercise constant control over the content of the work of the propagandists' training schools.

The work of training schools for propagandists, dealing with the history of the C.P.S.U., must be developed and adapted to the three basic forms of study of the history of the C.P.S.U., whereby it must be taken into consideration that, in the study of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, the propagandists' training schools must definitely have precedence over the study circles.

The training school must not be a place where propagandists are "pulverized." The instruction in the training schools must be designed so as to assure each participant creative work, a lively handling of theoretical questions, and comradely discussion on questions of theory and methods.

9. The department for agitation and propaganda of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. is obliged to gather together the most qualified propagandists of our Party, lecturers, "referents,"* consultants, who must contribute to theoretical reviews and central newspapers, deliver lectures and addresses in their districts, and afford effective help to the local organizations in the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

It is considered necessary to collect the experiences of the best propagandists and systematically to publish in the press the best lectures, addresses and consultations.

The town, district and provincial committees and the central committees of the national Communist Parties are recommended to convoke regular gatherings of propagandists and writers for the press, in order to discuss basic questions of propaganda.

10. To eliminate the underestimation of the press as the most important weapon of Marxism-Leninism and as an all-Union tribune of propaganda.

To enhance the importance of the press in the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism. To this end, the editorial staffs of *Pravda*, *Krassnaya Svezda*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, as well as of the Party and Y.C.L. newspapers of the republics, provinces and districts, are obliged systematically to publish articles on theoretical questions of Marxism-Leninism, consulations, lectures by the best propagandists, and "replies to readers." Propaganda departments are to be organized in the editorial offices of *Pravda*, *Krassnaya Svezda* and *Kom-*

---

* People responsible for collecting material, indicating sources, etc.

somolskaya Pravda, as well as in the Party and Y.C.L. newspapers of the republics, districts and provinces, at the head of which theoretically trained comrades must be placed, and the best propagandists must be drawn in to collaborate with the propaganda departments of the editorial offices.

It is considered necessary to transform the magazine *Bolshevik*, so that it becomes the theoretical organ of the Party and an all-Union consultation center for questions of Marxism-Leninism, and in its pages to discuss and reply to theoretical and political questions which interest Party members and non-Party people.

The department for Party agitation and propaganda of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the state publishing house for political literature are to be obliged to ensure the publication of popular pamphlets to help propagandists and particularly the lower group of the active workers—who are studying Party history; and also to draw up a plan for the publication of material for instruction in Party history.

11. To condemn the derogatory attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia, and towards the tasks of their ideological and political training in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, as repugnant and churlish. The Party organizations to be obliged to re-establish the correct Bolshevik attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia and to develop ideological-political work among the intelligentsia, the employees, students and the collective-farm intelligentsia. The elimination of the theoretical and political backwardness of the personnel of the Party and non-Party intelligentsia is to be considered as the first and most important task of the Party organizations in the field of propaganda, and every assistance must be rendered the Soviet intelligentsia in the mastering of Bolshevism and in the study of the history of the C.P.S.U. and the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

12. To recognize the serious backwardness of the workers on the theoretical front, which is expressed in their theoretical weakness, in their fear of boldly raising opportune theoretical questions, in the spread of hair-splitting and quibbling, in the vulgarization and superficial treatment of particular aspects of Marxism-Leninism, in the backwardness of theoretical thinking, in the inadequate theoretical generalization of the vast practical experience which the Party has gathered in all spheres of socialist construction. All workers on the theoretical front are called upon to abolish resolutely and swiftly the intolerable backwardness of the theoretical front, to overcome the fear of boldly raising theoretical questions which would further develop Marxist-Leninist theory, and to put an end to hair-splitting and quibbling, to scholasticism, and to the vulgarization and superficial treatment of particular aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory.

13. To eliminate the negligence in ideological work, which found particular expression in the unsatisfactory work of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute which permitted a number of distortions and inexactitudes to enter into the translation of works by Marx and Engels into the Russian language, as well as the grossest political errors, of a pernicious character, in the appendices, annotations and commentaries to some volumes of Lenin's works.

14. The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute to be obliged, within the shortest term, to rectify the distortions which have occurred in the translations of the works of Marx and Engels into the Russian language, and also the gross political errors which are contained in appendices and annotations to the works of V. I. Lenin; for example, in Volume XIII.

The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute is required to accelerate publication of the new edition of the works of Marx and Engels and of V. I. Lenin.

15. To note the detachment of our theoretical reviews from the burning questions of the life and struggle of our Party, their isolation and their tendency to academicism.

That the editorial staffs of the theoretical reviews pledge themselves to trans-

form their work, to ensure that in their pages will appear topical theoretical questions, the generalization of the experience of socialist construction, the satisfaction of the theoretical demands of our personnel, the working out of new theoretical problems, and creative discussions on theoretical questions.

16. Complementary to the system of more advanced political training of leading Party personnel, as laid down in the February-March plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., to carry out the following measures for continuation studies and training of qualified propagandist personnel of the Party:

A. To organize one-year courses for the further training of propagandists and writers for the press in the following centers: Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Rostov, Tbilisi, Baku, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Novosibirsk. The one-year courses for the further training of propagandists, which are to be organized in these centers, shall receive students, not only from their own particular province or district, but also from near-by districts, provinces and republics. The program of the one-year courses for propagandists must be drafted with reference to the program of the "Lenin course," and the instruction must be so devised as to ensure that a certain confidence is attained in propagandist work and in the independent thorough study of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

To set the total number of students for all the one-year courses for the further training of propagandists at from 1,500 to 2,000 persons, of whom about one-half must be collaborators on newspapers.

B. To organize under the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. a university for Marxism-Leninism, with three-year courses for the training of highly qualified theoretical personnel of the Party.

17. To establish the instruction in Marxist-Leninist theory in the universities upon the basis of the profound study of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* And, in connection with this:

A. To introduce, in place of the independent courses in Leninism and dialectical and historical materialism in the universities, a unified course in the "foundations of Marxism-Leninism," while retaining the general number of study-hours provided in the curriculum for social-economic subjects. Instruction in the foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory in the universities must begin with the study of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* accompanied by the study of Marxist-Leninist sources. Political-economic instruction shall take place after the conclusion of the study of the history of the C.P.S.U.

B. To establish, in place of the existing various chairs for dialectical and historical materialism, Leninism and the history of the C.P.S.U. in the universities, one unified faculty for Marxism-Leninism.

C. In those universities and institutes where there are faculties of philosophy, history and literature, to retain the course in dialectical and historical materialism in those faculties.

D. To instruct the department for propaganda and agitation of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the union committee for university affairs, for the beginning of the study year 1939-1940 to select leaders for the faculties of Marxism-Leninism, and to refer their selections to the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. for confirmation. To instruct the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, the provincial, district and town committees of the C.P.S.U., to select theoretically trained and politically tested teachers of the foundations of Marxism-Leninism.

E. To organize in the university for Marxism-Leninism a six-months' course for the further training of teachers of Marxism-Leninism for universities.

IV

In order fundamentally to improve the leadership by the Party of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. resolves:

18. To consolidate the departments for Party propaganda and agitation and the press and publishing departments of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, and of the provincial and district

committees of the C.P.S.U. and to establish unified departments for propaganda and agitation.

19. To concentrate the entire written and oral propaganda work of Marxism-Leninism and of political mass agitation in the departments of propaganda and agitation (Party press, publication of propaganda literature and agitational material, the organization of written and oral propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the control of the ideological content of propaganda work, the selection and allocation of propaganda personnel, the political education and training of Party personnel, the organization of political mass agitation).

The present resolution of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. is to be practically realized on the basis of the work of the departments of propaganda and agitation.

20. In order to improve the quality of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, it is necessary that, in the future the Party organizations, as a rule, depend for propaganda upon people who have been freed from all other work, who are absolutely dedicated to this work and can work unflaggingly to improve their theoretical and propagandist qualifications.

In this connection, to instruct the district and provincial committees of the C.P.S.U. to select the best propagandists for permanent propaganda work.

21. The functionaries of the departments for propaganda and agitation must be taken by the Party organs from the ranks of the best qualified professional propagandists and Party writers.

Lecture groups must be organized in the departments for propaganda and agitation of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., of the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, and of the provincial, district and town committees of the C.P.S.U.

22. In connection with the fact that, through the reduction in the number of study circles and also of Party education departments in factories and institutions, some of the propaganda functionaries in the towns will be free, to propose to the district and provincial committees, and to the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, that the best trained of these functionaries be sent to strengthen the propaganda work in the rural districts.

23. To reorganize the existing cultural and propaganda departments of the town and district committees of the Party and transform them into departments for propaganda and agitation. It is also considered necessary that in every district committee where at present there are no cultural and propaganda departments in existence, departments for propaganda and agitation be set up. To stipulate that the setting up of departments for propaganda and agitation in the district committees of the Party, at the request of district and provincial committees and of Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, shall be sanctioned by the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. to the extent to which qualified functionaries have been selected in each district.

To link up the town and district Party education departments with the departments for propaganda and agitation of the town and district Party committees, so that the leaders of the Party education departments can also function as substitutes for the leaders of the departments for propaganda and agitation.

24. To stipulate that the leaders of the departments for propaganda and agitation of the district committees and the provincial committees of the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, of the area, town and district committees of the Party, be approved by the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., all other responsible functionaries of the departments for propaganda and agitation of these committees to be approved by the bureaus of the district and provincial committees and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties.

That the district and provincial committees and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties be obliged, within a term of two months, to select and approve all functionaries of departments for propaganda and agitation.

25. In consideration of the close rela-

tionship between the work of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute and the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, it is considered necessary that the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute be placed under the control of the department for propaganda and agitation of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

26. The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. requires of all Party committees that they seriously occupy themselves with the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the most essential concern of the Bolshevik Party. The Party committees are obliged to lead in every respect the cause of propaganda and to acquaint themselves fundamentally with its content. The district and provincial committees and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties must take into their hands the leadership of the transformation of the entire organization of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, in conformity with this resolution.

Inasmuch as it is pointed out to all Party organizations that the transformation of the entire matter of propaganda work in the sense of this resolution of the C.C. demands from all Party organs particular attention and care, the C.C. warns the Party organizations against the danger of a mechanical and formal approach to the transformation of propaganda and against any attempt whatsoever at a summary disparagement of all former experiences of propagandist work.

To stipulate, for the improvement of the leadership of propaganda work, that in every town, district and provincial committee, and in the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, a special secretary exist who will be occupied exclusively with questions of the organization and the content of propaganda and agitation.

* * *

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. proposes to the district, town and provincial committees and to the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, that they explain this resolution to the Party "actives" and to all members of the Party.

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. emphasizes that the publication of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* must become the beginning of a change of course for our personnel—functionaries of the Party, of the Y.C.L., of the Soviets, trade unions, economy and culture; the personnel of the entire Soviet intelligentsia—towards the elimination of their theoretical backwardness.

The *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* lays the basis for a new and powerful ideological and political impetus in the life of our Party and of the Soviet people.

Through the mastery of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, equipped with the knowledge of the laws of social development, our personnel will become truly invincible, and, under the banner of this theory, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, will even more successfully lead the entire Soviet people to the victory of Communism.

November 14, 1938.

Chronicle of Events

THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

THE contrast between the rise of the new world of socialism and the economic, political and moral decline of the capitalist world was more glaring in November of this year than ever before. In the Soviet Union the workers in city and country were celebrating the twenty-first anniversary of their great October Revolution. Proudly and joyfully they looked back upon their path, which has always led, and is still constantly leading, to new economic and cultural successes in spite of all difficulties and the criminal sabotage undertaken by the Trotskyites and the Bukharinites.

In a world where uncertainty, economic anarchy and modern brigandage hold sway, the Soviet Union is the only country in which the workers systematically and methodically pursue their work of socialist construction, where they are being urged on to still greater efforts and to greater preparedness for the defense of their mighty achievements in face of the decline which the rest of the world is experiencing.

The twenty-first anniversary of the great October Revolution has shown the fascist warmongers of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis what is waiting for them, if they but try to disturb the Soviet people in their peaceful work of construction. Over all the cities in the Soviet Union cruised the countless squadrons of the Red air force. Across the squares thundered tanks and artillery of all sizes and calibres. Through the streets marched the endless columns of the Red Army and with them marched the armed workers from the factories, millions upon millions, who will protect, as one man, the defense of peace at the first call of their government. From the speeches made by the representatives of the Soviet people, on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the great revolution, rang out the resolute determination not to allow the jackals of fascism to reach the Soviet boundaries, but if they attacked, to annihilate them in their own dens.

THE BARBAROUS PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Meanwhile events since Munich have proved that the treacherous sacrifice of Czechoslovakia has served only to whet the appetite of the fascist beasts of prey and to intensify their ravings. During the days when the Soviet people were reviewing their brilliant rise from the backwardness and illiteracy of the tsarist regime, a wild orgy of cowardly and murderous attacks on defenseless people, of systematic arson, of organized robbery lit up the abyss, into which the once cultured, proud German people have been pushed by the base and vile gangs of the Nazi regime.

Winston Churchill, one of the most far-sighted politicians of English imperialism who is fully conscious of the dangers underlying the explosive nature of German fascist expansion, asked Hitler to tone down his regime after the "success" of Munich. Hitler's answer was a scornful "No."

Winston Churchill and others apparently do not understand that the "successes" of Hitler's foreign policy are not successes for the German people. The economic conditions of the working masses of Germany *cannot be improved* by the annexation of the Sudeten territory. The absolute lack of freedom and justice is leading to an ever-growing dis-

content, which is forcing the Nazi regime continually to seek new means of distracting the people's minds. Hence the conscious and organized planning of the Jewish pogrom.

The *Angriff* itself unmasked the aim of this Jewish pogrom by publishing the photograph of a Jew, who was alleged to have hoarded onions, butter and eggs and was therefore guilty of contributing towards the shortage of food. Another means of distraction was the demagogical "statistics" published in the Nazi press that were supposed to prove that the German Jews were richer than the Germans themselves. Another trick was the announcement that the Jews were to be expropriated and driven from their businesses and positions. The Nazi leaders are still conscious of the period before their coming into power when they realized that they could only gain power by demagogically exploiting the anti-capitalist feelings of the impoverished lower middle class. By expropriating the Jews they hope to drive away the specter of anti-capitalism.

Yet the proceeds from these thieving confiscations of property are flowing into the bottomless tills for war preparation. The posts in industry previously occupied by Jews, together with Jewish businesses and professional positions, are being taken over by "deserving" Nazis. The regime is stripping the Jews of all their possessions in order to enrich its own Praetorian Guard.

However, there are increasing signs that the anti-Semitic bugbear is losing its effectiveness. The German people are expressing more strongly than ever their disgust over the Jewish pogrom. Accounts in all the leading English, French, Dutch, Scandinavian and Swiss newspapers all come out with statements that the German nation is not in agreement with the Jewish pogrom. Several Nazi papers found themselves forced to start a controversy with a nameless but strong section of opposition among the people. German workers, soldiers and intellectuals dared to take it up in numerous cases. They went out of their way to express their sympathy to the Jews and to help them.

One can see in the anti-Semitic pogroms and their aims that they are intended to go further and take in other groups of the German people. In order to express their rage at the opposition inside Germany, the Nazis are sharpening their attacks on the Catholic Church. Evidence of this lies in the wild insults hurled by the Nazi press at Catholic dignitaries, and in the storming of Cardinal Faulhaber's palace in Munich by the Nazis. After suppressing the working class movement and organizing its battalions of destruction against the Jews, the Nazi regime still feels that it is being undermined by the intangible and silent opposition of the people. Hence it must always discover new enemies, persecute them and set them up as bugbears.

The abominable Jewish pogroms have called forth the protest of the masses throughout the entire world and in many cases have forced the governments of the bourgeois-democratic countries to condemn these crimes of the Nazi government. However, the public of the bourgeois-democratic countries has not truly understood that the Jewish pogrom, the horrible suppression of all movements aiming at freedom of the German people, the persecution of the Catholics and of the Protestant Church within Germany are merely an inseparable part of the Nazi regime's policy of imperialist expansion. The declarations of the Chamberlain Conservatives in England, the feeble protests of the French government press and Daladier's silence—all made it clear that the Jewish pogroms in Germany came at a most embarrassing moment for them all, since they fear them to be a stumbling block to their so-called policy of an understanding with the Nazi regime which is being formed at the cost of Spain, the colonial peoples and democracy.

The outcry over the Jewish pogroms has caused governments of the democratic countries to put aside for the moment the colonial question for a future time. Just now they do not dare to hand the African peoples over to the Nazi regime, for they would suffer the same fate as the Jews in Germany. The work-

ing people of the bourgeois-democratic countries are insisting more strongly than ever that the opportunity for democratic development be given to the colonial peoples and that they shall not be considered as a pawn in the plotting between the reactionary bourgeoisie of the bourgeois-democratic countries and the fascist regimes.

Meanwhile the Nazi regime proves with cynical blatancy that anti-Semitism is not only to be a weapon designed to fog and hold down the German people, but that it is to help as an article of export to bring Southeast Europe under the complete sovereignty of German fascism. Smirkingly the Nazi press reports the beginning of Jewish pogroms in Slovakia and in Rumania.

With the help of anti-Semitism Nazi agents are trying more than ever to bring internal confusion to the nations of Southeast Europe and to overthrow them, so that they may be able to force them all the more easily under the Nazi yoke. The same German fascism which yesterday carved up Czechoslovakia is now playing the part of "protector" to the Slovakian and Carpathian-Ukrainian peoples against Hungary, whose territorial claims it traces back to the influence of the Jews in Hungary. In anti-Semitism the German fascists see the means of keeping the peoples of Southeastern Europe in a state of constant unrest, and of exhausting them by playing them off one against the other in order that they themselves may be able to realize all the more easily their own plans for domination.

* * *

Now that Chamberlain and Daladier have handed over Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany in Munich arrangements are being made to deliver republican Spain to general exploitation and suppression by German and Italian fascism. Chamberlain is adding to his previous violation of treaties the rupture of his own plan for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Spain. The fighters of the International Brigade have returned home. Yet fascist intervention on Franco's side continues to be more and more vigorous. In spite of all that, Chamberlain is playing with the thought of recognizing Franco's government as a belligerent power, in order to support openly intervention against Spanish democracy. The friends of democracy and of peace have started a new campaign against a repetition of the Munich betrayal. The English trade unions have protested against the intended selling out of republican Spain.

The International Peace Campaign is arranging a plebiscite in the democratic countries calling upon the democratic governments to insist on an immediate withdrawal of fascist intervention troops. It depends on the breadth and depth of this campaign as to whether the game played in reactionary circles in England and France will be stopped. Simultaneously new efforts are being made in the democratic countries to provide republican Spain with food.

* * *

In France Daladier's government is proving that a foreign policy in the service of the aggressive powers has its counterpart in a reactionary domestic policy. Encouraged by Munich, the 200 families and their agents in the middle class parties have started an offensive against the gains made by the People's Front, and have entrusted Daladier with the leadership of this offensive. At the Congress of the Radical Socialist Party, Daladier announced his new policy by slanderously attacking the French Communists. With his emergency decrees Daladier wants to put a definite end to the 40-hour week, to weaken the fighting power of the French trade unions and to transfer to the working people the costs of armaments and the burdens of the economic sabotage by big capital.

The discontent at the emergency decrees even embraced the ranks of the Radical Socialist Party. Daladier knows that even the Radical Socialist electorate is not in agreement with his policy. When voting took place in parliament and in the commissions, he was only able to carry through his policy by leaning on the representatives of open reaction.

Fearing the masses, he entertains the idea of prolonging the term of the present Chamber and of eliminating parliament.

But the demonstrations of protest and the partial strikes that took place throughout France have proved that the French masses are not prepared to allow their gains of recent years to be wrested from them. The Congress of the General Confederation of Labor expressed the determination to defend with all possible might the gains made by the People's Front.

Even if certain trade union leaders with a Right-wing tendency tried to extol the Munich result and simultaneously undertook to attack the French Communist Party, the Congress expressed the unanimous feeling that it had met to take up the fight against those undertaking the offensive, against the fascists who were beginning to raise their heads; against the warmongers and against the Extraordinary Decrees of the French government.

Daladier, however, did not understand this warning. The French reactionaries carried through the postponement of the parliamentary session which had been fixed for November 15, in order to prevent a debate on the emergency measures and the domestic situation in general.

As a protest against this policy of Daladier's, the C.G.T. fixed a 24-hour general strike for November 30. As soon as this resolution was made known to them, the government and reactionary circles undertook all measures and preparations in order to frustrate the general strike. They threatened to use complete war-time powers in the mines, on the railways and in the postal and telegraph services, and not only to dismiss civil servants if they took part in the strike, but also to arrest them. In addition police and military measures were ordered against the strikers. All railway stations were occupied, and the workers were partly driven to work with rifles. Arrests began already on the eve of the strike.

This commandeering of the entire state apparatus in order to frustrate the general strike was bound to have some effect. Nevertheless in some places and in various branches of industry, the general strike was carried through 100 per cent and in the remainder of the country as much as from 75 to 95 per cent.

The government and French reactionaries tried to assert that no general strike had taken place. But the reactionary measures and reprisals against the participants in the strike prove the opposite. Mass dismissals, the closing of entire businesses, and the lockout of big staffs of workers, mass arrests and legal proceedings against those taking part in the strike prove that the general strike did not fail to produce an effect on the government and on reaction in France.

Now as before, Daladier's resignation is being demanded by the working people of France and in many democratic circles, for his policy is directed against all the gains made by the French workers through the People's Front, against the Communist Party, against the C.G.T. and against the right of the workers to strike. The C.G.T. and the Communist Party, which express the will of the widest masses of working class people, will not make any concessions at all to reaction.

On December 1, Jouhaux, head of the C.G.T., wrote in the *Peuple* that the C. G.T. was carrying on its activity and would continue to do so until a definite end was put to the emergency measures. The Communist Party parliamentary members published a declaration of protest against the illegal measures of the government. This declaration emphasized the responsibility of the government, when by closing the nationalized aircraft factories and arsenals, they ran the risk of endangering the country's security, especially at a moment when the fascist deputies in the Italian "parliament" were shouting the demand: "We want Tunis, Corsica and Savoy."

* * *

In England the events of recent weeks point to the growing opposition of the English people to the policy of Chamberlain. The mass of the English feel that Munich did not bring peace and that the dictatorial terms of Munich can only

lead to a strengthening of the anti-democratic forces in all countries. At the Bridgewater by-election the voters had their first opportunity of voting clearly and plainly for or against the policy of Chamberlain, the policy of conspiring with the fascist aggressors. The result at Bridgewater not only throws light on the real feeling of the English people but also on the vacillating, hesitant and leaderless policy of the Labor Party.

At the last general election, the government candidate was re-elected with a majority of about 3,000 votes over the combined votes given to the Liberal and Labor candidates. At the present by-election the Labor Party had not put up its own candidate. The Labor leaders of that constituency knew that in that district a Labor candidate would not win by his own efforts. They supported the progressive candidate, who openly declared that he would contest the election on the issue for or against the Chemberlain policy and that under this banner he wanted to unite the entire opposition to Chamberlain. The success was most striking. The Conservative candidate lost to the progressive candidate by 2,000 votes. The voters had had the opportunity of openly expressing their opinion on Chamberlain's foreign policy and this led to a negative result for him. Even the Conservative press had to declare that this election result had brought to light the uneasiness of the electorate over the policy of Chamberlain.

However, the Conservatives succeeded in winning a by-election in the constituency of Walsall. There the Labor candidate had not considered the importance of placing Chamberlain's foreign policy in the foreground, or of calling upon all progressive forces to unite in dealing a blow at this policy. The result was a victory for the Conservatives. The Labor Party press systematically tried to minimize the significance of the Bridgewater election.

The Right-wing leaders of the Labor Party and of the English trade unions feel that the Bridgewater election result is a proof positive argument for the union of all democratic and progressive forces in a common peace front against Chamberlain. However, now as before, they refuse to tread this one path on which it is possible to contest with success the Chamberlain policy.

In this way the British Labor movement once again runs the danger of losing the possibility of placing itself at the head of the British people, of laying the foundations for a new peace policy and of protecting English democracy against all combined onslaughts by Hitler and Mussolini.

One section of the English bourgeoisie recognizes with growing reluctance that Chamberlain is endangering the national interests of Britain by his pro-fascist policy, and regards with growing disquietude the series of sharp reverses in foreign politics for which Chamberlain is responsible. Under the leadership of Eden, Churchill and Duff Cooper a Conservative opposition has been formed, which is openly striving to bring about a new government. Eden has drawn up in his program a list of demands aimed first and foremost at an alteration in the foreign policy and at the security of democracy in the interest of the country's defenses. Certain contacts were established between the Conservative opposition and the Liberals, but the Labor Party refuses to collaborate with the middle class opposition, although it must be clear to the Labor Party that a Labor government is not possible at the moment and that Chamberlain can only be overthrown by a united opposition.

The Chamberlain policy is driving on towards its bankruptcy. Whether a progressive and democratic policy under the leadership of the British labor movement will result depends above all on whether the masses in the British trade unions and the Labor Party force their leaders to take over the leadership of the English people by forming a broad and progressive peace front.

"LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CANNOT BE FREE
WHILE LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS BRANDED."—**KARL MARX**

THE NEGRO

AND THE

DEMOCRATIC FRONT

by JAMES W. FORD

Price $1.75

" . . . It is a product of thought and action in the great progressive movements of our time. It is a most valuable help to Communist and non-Communists alike for clearer understanding and more effective practical activity."—ALEX. BITTELMAN.

Comrade Ford's book is a real achievement in the forward march of the Negro people. Here, in simple terms, concrete experience and practical policies, is the democratic front program that will eventually put the Negro masses on the way to freedom. Every member of our Party should familiarize himself with its invaluable contents."

—WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D New York, N. Y.

New Books

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

A MARXIST INTRODUCTION

by Prof. Howard Selsam

A primer of dialectical materialism, written especially for the layman. Shows how close philosophy is to every-day reality. **$1.25**

CHILD WORKERS IN AMERICA

by Katharine DuPre Lumpkin and Dorothy Wolff Douglas

A detailed and definitive study of child labor in the United States. A basic economic work, intensely interesting.

Special reprint $1.00

SALUD!

Poems and Stories of Spain by American Authors

This is the first in a series of literary pamphlets. Packed with stirring poems and stories. A new type of publication **10 cents**

THE NEGRO IN THE CIVIL WAR

by Herbert Aptheker

A scholarly but popularly written study, full of material giving an entirely new picture of the role of the Negro people. **10 cents**

Coming Soon—

GERMAN IDEOLOGY by Marx and Engels
DOLORES IBARRURI, Speeches and Articles—1936-1938
CAPITALISM AND POLITICAL ECONOMY by Maurice Dobb
REVOLUTION IN SPAIN by Marx and Engels

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D · New York, N. Y.